

# **CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: Parts I and II**

for  
STATE FORMULA GRANT PROGRAMS  
under the  
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT  
As amended by the  
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

For reporting on  
**School Year 2003-2004**



**PART I DUE JANUARY 31, 2005  
PART II DUE APRIL 15, 2005**

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION  
WASHINGTON, DC 20202**

## INTRODUCTION

Sections 9302 and 9303 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) provide to States the option of applying for and reporting on multiple ESEA programs through a single consolidated application and report. Although a central, practical purpose of the Consolidated State Application and Report is to reduce "red tape" and burden on States, the Consolidated State Application and Report are also intended to have the important purpose of encouraging the integration of State, local, and ESEA programs in comprehensive planning and service delivery and enhancing the likelihood that the State will coordinate planning and service delivery across multiple State and local programs. The combined goal of all educational agencies -- State, local, and federal -- is a more coherent, well-integrated educational plan that will result in improved teaching and learning.

The Consolidated State Application and Report includes the following ESEA programs:

- Title I, Part A – *Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies*
- Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 – *William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs*
- Title I, Part C – *Education of Migratory Children*
- Title I, Part D – *Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk*
- Title I, Part F – *Comprehensive School Reform*
- Title II, Part A – *Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund)*
- Title II, Part D – *Enhancing Education through Technology*
- Title III, Part A – *English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement Act*
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1 - *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities State Grants*
- Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2 – *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities National Activities (Community Service Grant Program)*
- Title IV, Part B – *21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers*
- Title V, Part A – *Innovative Programs*
- Title VI, Section 6111 – *Grants for State Assessments and Related Activities*
- Title VI, Part B – *Rural Education Achievement Program*

The NCLB Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2003-2004 school year consists of two information collections. Part I of this report is due to the Department by January 31, 2005. Part II is due to the Department by April 15, 2005.

## **PART I**

Part I of the Consolidated State Report, which States must submit to the Department by **January 31, 2005**, requests information related to the five ESEA Goals, established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application, and information required for the Annual State Report to the Secretary, as described in section 1111(h)(4) of NCLB. The five ESEA Goals established in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application are as follows:

- **Performance goal 1:** By 2013-2014, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.

- **Performance goal 2:** All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.
- **Performance goal 3:** By 2005-2006, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.
- **Performance goal 4:** All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.
- **Performance Goal 5:** All students will graduate from high school.

## **PART II**

Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report consists of information related to State activities and outcomes of specific ESEA programs for the 2003-2004 school year. Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report is due to the Department by **April 15, 2005**. The information requested in Part II of the Consolidated State Performance Report for the 2003-2004 school year necessarily varies from program to program. However, for all programs, the specific information requested for this report meets the following criteria.

1. The information is needed for Department program performance plans or for other program needs.
2. The information is not available from another source, including program evaluations.
3. The information will provide valid evidence of program outcomes or results.
4. The Consolidated State Performance Report is the best vehicle for collection of the data.

The Department is continuing to work with the Performance-Based Data Management Initiative (PBDMI) to streamline data collections for the 2003-2004 school year and beyond.

## GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS AND TIMELINES

All States that received funding on the basis of the Consolidated State Application for the 2003-2004 school year must respond to this Consolidated State Performance Report. Part I of the Report is due to the Department by **January 31, 2005**. Part II of the Report is due to the Department by **April 15, 2005**. Both Part I and Part II should reflect data from the 2003-2004 school year, unless otherwise noted. If needed, States should include for each section an explanation of the data provided (e.g., data irregularities).

States may use this format or a format of their choosing to submit the required information. If the information is available through another source, States may refer the Department to that source, e.g., State Report Cards. If a State refers the Department to another source, it must provide specific information on where the data may be accessed, e.g. the URL for the State Report Card.

## TRANSMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

To expedite the receipt of this report, please send your report via the Internet as a .doc file, pdf file, rtf or .txt file to [conreport@ed.gov](mailto:conreport@ed.gov), or provide the URL for the site where your submission is posted on the Internet. Please send a follow-up, signed paper copy of "Consolidated State Performance Report Signature Page" via an express courier to the address below.

A State that submits only a paper report should mail the submission by express courier to:

Daisy Greenfield  
U.S. Department of Education  
Room 3E307  
400 Maryland Avenue, S.W.  
Washington, DC 20202-6400

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1965, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 1810-0614. The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 182 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimates(s) or suggestions for improving this form, please write directly to Consolidated State Performance Report, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Room 3E231, Washington, DC 20202-6400.

OMB Number: 1810-0614  
Expiration Date: 07/31/2006

Consolidated State Performance Report  
For  
State Formula Grant Programs  
under the  
Elementary And Secondary Education Act  
as amended by the  
No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

Name of State Educational Agency (SEA) Submitting This Report:  
Montana Office of Public Instruction

Address:  
PO Box 202502, Helena, MT 59620-2501

Person to contact about this report:

Name: Nancy Coopersmith

Telephone: (406) 444-5541

Fax: (406) 444-1373

e-mail: ncoopersmith@mt.gov

Name of Authorizing State Official: (Print or Type):  
Linda McCulloch

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

# **CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART I**

For reporting on  
**School Year 2003-2004**



**PART I DUE JANUARY 31, 2005**

**I. STANDARDS and ASSESSMENT DEVELOPMENT**

Section 1111(b)(1) of ESEA requires States to adopt challenging academic content and achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science and to develop assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels. In the following sections, States are asked to provide a detailed description of their progress in meeting the NCLB standards and assessments requirements.

**A. Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in adopting challenging academic content standards in science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1).**

**STATE RESPONSE**

**Standards** – The Montana Office of Public Instruction, in partnership with the Montana Board of Public Education and Montana education stakeholders, facilitated a process to complete the revision of K-12 content standards and performance standards in all subject areas, thereby developing the Montana K-12 Standards Framework. The Montana K-12 Standards Framework describes what all public school students will know and be able to do upon graduation from the Montana education system. The Board adopted the standards into Administrative Rules of Montana, Chapter 54, Content and Performance Standards. These K-12 content and performance standards are aligned to the educator preparation program standards. The K-12 Content and Performance Standards for Science were adopted by the Board of Public Education in the fall of 1999.

The Montana K-12 Standards Framework defines the general knowledge of what all students should know, understand, and be able to do in each subject area and sets specific expectations for student learning at three benchmarks along the K-12 continuum. These benchmarks are at the end of fourth grade, eighth grade, and upon graduation. Performance standards describe student achievement at each of these benchmarks at four performance levels: advanced, proficient, nearing proficiency, and novice. The content standards, benchmark expectations, and corresponding performance levels provide teachers, parents, students, and the public with a clear understanding of what students are expected to learn and how well they are able to apply their learning.

**Montana revised the K-12 content and performance standards as follows:**

<b>CYCLES</b>	<b>STANDARDS</b>	<b>ADOPTION</b>
Cycle 1:	Reading and Mathematics	Fall 1998
Cycle 2:	Communication Arts, Science, Health Enhancement, Technology, and World Languages	Fall 1999
Cycle 3:	Social Studies, Arts, Library Media, and Workplace Competencies	Fall 2000
Cycle 4:	Program Delivery, Program Foundation, Career and Technical Education	Fall 2001



Pursuant to Administrative Rules of Montana, 10.54.2503 Standards Review Schedule (1) Montana's Content and Performance Standards shall be reviewed and revised on a five-year cycle beginning July 1, 2005. (2) A schedule for review of specific programs shall be established as a collaborative process with the office of public instruction and the board of public education with input from representatives of accredited schools. (3) The standards review process shall use context information, criteria, processes, and procedures identified by the office of public instruction with input from representatives of accredited schools.

In July 2005, the Office of Public Instruction will facilitate a process to review and revise the Science Content and Performance Standards. This process will follow the guideline outlined by the Board of Public Education in the following document. (This document will be revised by the Board of Public Education in March 2005.)

**B. Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in developing and implementing, in consultation with LEAs, assessments in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(3) in the required grade levels. Please provide in your response a description of the State's progress in developing alternate assessments for students with disabilities, including alternate assessments aligned to alternate achievement standards and those aligned to grade-level achievement standards.**

**STATE RESPONSE**

Following a Request for Proposals (RFP) process which included Montana educators, Measured Progress, a testing contractor from New Hampshire was chosen for the Montana Criterion-Referenced Test (CRT) and CRT-Alternate. The following is the Montana CRT and the CRT-Alternate administration schedule

- School year 2003-2004: Reading and math in grades 4, 8, and 10
- School year 2004-2005: Reading and math in grades 4, 8, and 10
- School year 2005-2006: Reading and math in grades 3-8 and 10
- School year 2006-2007: Reading and math in grades 3-8 and 10
- School year 2007-2008:
  - Reading and math in grades 3-8 and 10
  - Science in grades 4, 8, and 10

The contract with Measured Progress includes professional development and test development. In addition, the Office of Public Instruction provides other professional development related to assessment. Educators from across the state and representative of Montana's population have participated in the activities; in addition, video tapes and related materials are available for check out from the Office of Public Instruction Resource Center. The following is a sample of the opportunities for participation in professional development.

Workshops Presented	Test Development Participation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teacher as Assessor</li> <li>• Examining Student Work</li> <li>• Student-based Classroom</li> <li>• Reading the Reports</li> <li>• Strategies for Constructed Response Items</li> <li>• Classroom Use of Test Results</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of grade level expectations</li> <li>• Item writing and revision and content and bias review</li> <li>• Benchmarking constructed response items</li> <li>• Standard setting</li> <li>• Pilot testing</li> <li>• CRT-Alternate test development</li> <li>• CRT-Alternate Expanded Academic Benchmarks</li> </ul>

Test development includes the following steps:

- External alignment of the Measured Progress off-the-shelf test Progress Towards Standards, (PTS) to Montana Content Standards (Norman Webb alignment model was used)
- Grade-Level Expectations (GLEs) in reading and math were developed for grades 3, 5, 6 and 7 and revised for grades 4, 8 and 10
- Development of items necessary to augment Progress Towards Standards (PTS) to cover Montana Standards
  - Educators from across the state representative of Montana's population participated in item writing and revision, content and bias reviews, pilot testing, item analysis and selection, and benchmarking constructed response items.
- Montana educators participated in national (PTS) content and bias review committee meetings
- Test administration training
  - Test coordinator and administrator manuals reviewed in detail
  - Video broadcasts at more than 20 sites across the state
  - Videos available for checkout from the Office of Public Instruction
  - Video stream online
  - Video of training included with testing material shipment
- Benchmarking and scoring – Montana educators participated in benchmarking and scoring of constructed-response items.

- Standard setting--Montana educators participate in standard setting. The Bookmark was used for the CRT; the Modified Body of Work was used for the CRT-Alternate
- Results reported to schools, districts, and state
  - Paper reports
  - Electronic reports
  - Interpretive Guide
  - Video broadcast on Reading the Results
- Copies of video available through the Office of Public Instruction Resource Center
- Broadcast online via video stream
- Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) meets twice a year, January and July, to review technical procedures and advise OPI on technical issues
- Technical Manual
  - Reviewed by TAC
  - Published after results calculated
  - Posted online

**C. Please provide a detailed description of the State's progress in setting, in consultation with LEAs, academic achievement standards in mathematics, reading/language arts, and science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1). If applicable, please provide in your response a description of the State's progress in developing alternate achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.**

## STATE RESPONSE

Standard setting for grades 4, 8, and 10 in reading and math for the Criterion-Reference Test (CRT) and Criterion-Referenced Test-Alternate (CRT-Alt) was conducted and included participation by Montana educators from across the state representative of Montana's population. Measured Progress provided the training and facilitated the panels. The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) reviewed the methods and results.

The method used for the CRT is the Modified Bookmark. For the CRT-Alternate, the Modified Body of Work method was used. For both methods, Measured Progress provided the facilitators, materials, training, and impact data generated by the cut score choices. For both the CRT and the CRT-Alternate, the educator/panelists were divided into six grade/content area groups of about 15 people each group working independently of the other groups.

Performance descriptors for the CRT are:

- *Advanced*: This level denotes superior performance
- *Proficient*: This level denotes solid academic performance for each benchmark. Students reaching this level have demonstrated competency over challenging subject matter, including subject-matter knowledge, application of such knowledge to real-world situations, and analytical skills appropriate to the subject matter.
- *Nearing Proficiency*: This level denotes that the student has partial mastery or prerequisite knowledge and skills fundamental for proficient work at each benchmark
- *Novice*: This level denotes that the student is beginning to attain the prerequisite knowledge and skills that are fundamental for work at each benchmark.

To measure the knowledge, skills, and abilities of students with significant cognitive disabilities, using Montana content standards in reading and math, expanded benchmarks were developed within grade span expectations. Beginning with the standards, the development encompassed the essence of the standard, grade level expectations, and expanded benchmarks with grade level expectations. The expanded benchmarks describe the scope and sequence of the acquisition of content related knowledge, skills, and abilities along a learning continuum in which the standards become reachable and teachable.

Performance descriptors for the CRT-Alternate are:

- *Advanced:* The student at the Advanced level accurately and independently demonstrates the ability to carry out comprehensive content specific performance indicators.
- *Proficient:* The student at the Proficient level, given limited prompting, demonstrates the ability to respond accurately in performing a wide variety of content specific performance indicators.
- *Nearing Proficiency:* The student at the Nearing Proficiency level, given moderate prompting, demonstrates the ability to respond accurately in performing a narrow set of content specific performance indicators.
- *Novice:* The student at the Novice level, given physical assistance and/or modeling, is supported to participate in content specific performance indicators.

## **II. PARTICIPATION IN STATE ASSESSMENTS**

### **A. Participation of All Students in 2003-2004 State Assessments**

In the following tables, please provide the total number and percentage for each of the listed subgroups of students who participated in the State's 2003-2004 school year academic assessments.

The data provided below for students with disabilities should include participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Act and do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

**Student Participation in 2003-2004 School Year Test Administration**

<b>2003-2004 School Year Mathematics Assessment</b>	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Tested</b>
All Students	<b>34,416</b>	<b>99.3</b>
American Indian/Alaska Native	<b>3,654</b>	<b>98.4</b>
Asian/Pacific Islander	<b>377</b>	<b>99.2</b>
Black, non-Hispanic	<b>235</b>	<b>99.6</b>
Hispanic	<b>678</b>	<b>99.0</b>
White, non-Hispanic	<b>29,472</b>	<b>99.4</b>
Students with Disabilities	<b>3,967</b>	<b>98.5</b>
Limited English Proficient	<b>1,124</b>	<b>98.3</b>
Economically Disadvantaged	<b>10,617</b>	<b>99.2</b>
Migrant	<b>77</b>	<b>98.7</b>
Male	<b>17,745</b>	<b>99.3</b>
Female	<b>16,671</b>	<b>99.3</b>

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

<b>2003-2004 School Year Reading/Language Arts Assessment</b>	<b>Total Number of Students Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students Tested</b>
All Students	<b>34,475</b>	<b>99.5</b>
American Indian/ Alaska Native	<b>3,666</b>	<b>98.7</b>
Asian/ Pacific Islander	<b>378</b>	<b>99.5</b>
Black, non-Hispanic	<b>234</b>	<b>99.2</b>
Hispanic	<b>680</b>	<b>99.3</b>
White, non-Hispanic	<b>29,517</b>	<b>99.6</b>
Students with Disabilities	<b>3,987</b>	<b>99.0</b>
Limited English Proficient	<b>1,127</b>	<b>98.6</b>
Economically Disadvantaged	<b>10,639</b>	<b>99.4</b>
Migrant	<b>77</b>	<b>98.7</b>
Male	<b>17,776</b>	<b>99.5</b>
Female	<b>16,699</b>	<b>99.5</b>

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

## B. Participation of Students with Disabilities in State Assessment System

Students with disabilities (as defined under IDEA) participate in the State's assessment system either by taking the regular State assessment, with or without accommodations, by taking an alternate assessment aligned to grade-level standards, or by taking an alternate assessment aligned to alternate achievement standards. In the following table, please provide the total number and percentage of students with disabilities who participated in these various assessments.

The data provided below should include participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Act and do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

### Participation of Students with Disabilities the in 2003-2004 School Year Test Administration

<b>2003-2004 School Year Mathematics Assessment</b>	<b>Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested</b>
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	<b>3,704</b>	<b>92.0</b>
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	<b>263</b>	<b>6.5</b>

<b>2003-2004 School Year Reading/Language Arts Assessment</b>	<b>Total Number of Students with Disabilities Tested</b>	<b>Percent of Students with Disabilities Tested</b>
Regular Assessment, with or without accommodations	<b>3,723</b>	<b>92.5</b>
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Grade-Level Achievement Standards		
Alternate Assessment Aligned to Alternate Achievement Standards	<b>264</b>	<b>6.6</b>

### **III. STUDENT ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT**

In the following charts, please provide student achievement data from the 2003-2004 school year test administration. Charts have been provided for each of grades 3 through 8 and high school to accommodate the varied State assessment systems in mathematics and reading/language arts during the 2003-2004 school year. States should provide data on the percentage of students scoring at the proficient or advanced levels for those grades in which the State administered mathematics and reading/language arts assessments during the 2003-2004 school year.

The data for students with disabilities should include participation results from all students with disabilities as defined under the Individuals with Disabilities Act, including results from alternate assessments, and do not include results from students covered under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

<b>Grade 3 Mathematics</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 03-04</b>
All Students	
American Indian/Alaska Native	
Asian/Pacific Islander	
Black, non-Hispanic	
Hispanic	
White, non-Hispanic	
Students with Disabilities	
Limited English Proficient	
Economically Disadvantaged	
Migrant	
Male	
Female	

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

<b>Grade 3 Reading/Language Arts</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 03-04</b>
All Students	
American Indian/Alaska Native	
Asian/Pacific Islander	
Black, non-Hispanic	
Hispanic	
White, non-Hispanic	
Students with Disabilities	
Limited English Proficient	
Economically Disadvantaged	
Migrant	
Male	
Female	

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.



<b>Grade 4 Mathematics</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 03-04</b>
All Students	<b>45.3</b>
American Indian/Alaska Native	<b>21.7</b>
Asian/Pacific Islander	<b>52.7</b>
Black, non-Hispanic	<b>32.0</b>
Hispanic	<b>35.8</b>
White, non-Hispanic	<b>48.9</b>
Students with Disabilities	<b>21.5</b>
Limited English Proficient	<b>15.0</b>
Economically Disadvantaged	<b>32.8</b>
Migrant	<b>48.6</b>
Male	<b>46.3</b>
Female	<b>44.2</b>

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

<b>Grade 4 Reading/Language Arts</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 03-04</b>
All Students	<b>65.8</b>
American Indian/Alaska Native	<b>37.7</b>
Asian/Pacific Islander	<b>69.5</b>
Black, non-Hispanic	<b>54.4</b>
Hispanic	<b>55.8</b>
White, non-Hispanic	<b>70.0</b>
Students with Disabilities	<b>30.5</b>
Limited English Proficient	<b>20.7</b>
Economically Disadvantaged	<b>51.5</b>
Migrant	<b>56.8</b>
Male	<b>63.6</b>
Female	<b>68.0</b>

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

<b>Grade 5 Mathematics</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 03-04</b>
All Students	
American Indian/Alaska Native	
Asian/Pacific Islander	
Black, non-Hispanic	
Hispanic	
White, non-Hispanic	
Students with Disabilities	
Limited English Proficient	
Economically Disadvantaged	
Migrant	
Male	
Female	

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

<b>Grade 5 Reading/Language Arts</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 03-04</b>
All Students	
American Indian/Alaska Native	
Asian/Pacific Islander	
Black, non-Hispanic	
Hispanic	
White, non-Hispanic	
Students with Disabilities	
Limited English Proficient	
Economically Disadvantaged	
Migrant	
Male	
Female	

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

<b>Grade 6 Mathematics</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 03-04</b>
All Students	
American Indian/Alaska Native	
Asian/Pacific Islander	
Black, non-Hispanic	
Hispanic	
White, non-Hispanic	
Students with Disabilities	
Limited English Proficient	
Economically Disadvantaged	
Migrant	
Male	
Female	

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

<b>Grade 6 Reading/Language Arts</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 03-04</b>
All Students	
American Indian/Alaska Native	
Asian/Pacific Islander	
Black, non-Hispanic	
Hispanic	
White, non-Hispanic	
Students with Disabilities	
Limited English Proficient	
Economically Disadvantaged	
Migrant	
Male	
Female	

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

<b>Grade 7 Mathematics</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 03-04</b>
All Students	
American Indian/Alaska Native	
Asian/Pacific Islander	
Black, non-Hispanic	
Hispanic	
White, non-Hispanic	
Students with Disabilities	
Limited English Proficient	
Economically Disadvantaged	
Migrant	
Male	
Female	

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

<b>Grade 7 Reading/Language Arts</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 03-04</b>
All Students	
American Indian/Alaska Native	
Asian/Pacific Islander	
Black, non-Hispanic	
Hispanic	
White, non-Hispanic	
Students with Disabilities	
Limited English Proficient	
Economically Disadvantaged	
Migrant	
Male	
Female	

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

<b>Grade 8 Mathematics</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 03-04</b>
All Students	<b>64.1</b>
American Indian/Alaska Native	<b>29.6</b>
Asian/Pacific Islander	<b>79.3</b>
Black, non-Hispanic	<b>43.4</b>
Hispanic	<b>54.6</b>
White, non-Hispanic	<b>68.9</b>
Students with Disabilities	<b>21.3</b>
Limited English Proficient	<b>15.9</b>
Economically Disadvantaged	<b>47.0</b>
Migrant	<b>72.0</b>
Male	<b>63.7</b>
Female	<b>64.6</b>

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

<b>Grade 8 Reading/Language Arts</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 03-04</b>
All Students	<b>58.3</b>
American Indian/Alaska Native	<b>28.9</b>
Asian/Pacific Islander	<b>74.1</b>
Black, non-Hispanic	<b>43.4</b>
Hispanic	<b>45.4</b>
White, non-Hispanic	<b>62.5</b>
Students with Disabilities	<b>18.2</b>
Limited English Proficient	<b>11.3</b>
Economically Disadvantaged	<b>41.4</b>
Migrant	<b>40.0</b>
Male	<b>53.0</b>
Female	<b>63.9</b>

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

<b>High School Mathematics Grade 10</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 03-04</b>
All Students	<b>60.2</b>
American Indian/Alaska Native	<b>25.0</b>
Asian/Pacific Islander	<b>65.4</b>
Black, non-Hispanic	<b>31.6</b>
Hispanic	<b>43.4</b>
White, non-Hispanic	<b>64.3</b>
Students with Disabilities	<b>17.7</b>
Limited English Proficient	<b>16.8</b>
Economically Disadvantaged	<b>42.2</b>
Migrant	<b>62.5</b>
Male	<b>59.0</b>
Female	<b>61.4</b>

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

<b>High School Reading/Language Arts</b>	<b>Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced School Year 03-04</b>
All Students	<b>63.1</b>
American Indian/Alaska Native	<b>30.1</b>
Asian/Pacific Islander	<b>65.4</b>
Black, non-Hispanic	<b>45.6</b>
Hispanic	<b>51.5</b>
White, non-Hispanic	<b>66.9</b>
Students with Disabilities	<b>18.5</b>
Limited English Proficient	<b>14.2</b>
Economically Disadvantaged	<b>44.9</b>
Migrant	<b>50.0</b>
Male	<b>55.5</b>
Female	<b>71.4</b>

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

**IV. SCHOOL and DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY**

**A.** For all public elementary and secondary schools and districts in the State (Title I and non-Title I), please provide the total number and percentage of all schools and districts that made adequate yearly progress (AYP), based on data from the 2003-2004 school year.

<b>School Accountability</b>	<b>Total number of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State</b>	<b>Total number of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP</b>	<b>Percentage of public elementary and secondary schools (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP</b>
Based on 2003-2004 School Year Data	<b>857</b>	<b>731</b>	<b>85.3</b>

<b>District Accountability</b>	<b>Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State</b>	<b>Total number of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP</b>	<b>Percentage of public elementary and secondary districts (Title I and non-Title I) in State that made AYP</b>
Based on 2003-2004 School Year Data	<b>438</b>	<b>362</b>	<b>82.6</b>

**B.** For all Title I schools and districts in the State, please provide the total number and percentage of all Title I schools and districts that made AYP, based on data from the 2003-2004 school year.

<b>Title I School Accountability</b>	<b>Total number of Title I schools in State</b>	<b>Total number of Title I schools in State that made AYP</b>	<b>Percentage of Title I schools in State that made AYP</b>
Based on 2003-2004 School Year Data	<b>679</b>	<b>568</b>	<b>83.7</b>

<b>Title I District Accountability</b>	<b>Total number of Title I districts in State</b>	<b>Total number of Title I districts in State that made AYP</b>	<b>Percentage of Title I districts in State that made AYP</b>
Based on 2003-2004 School Year Data	<b>345</b>	<b>275</b>	<b>79.7</b>

### **C. Title I Schools Identified for Improvement**

1. In the following chart, please provide a list of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring under section 1116 for the 2004-2005 school year, based upon data from the 2003-2004 school year. For each school listed, please provide the name of the school's district, the areas in which the school missed AYP (e.g., missing reading proficiency target, reading participation rate, other academic indicator), and the school improvement status for the 2004-2005 school year (e.g., school in need of improvement year 1, school in need of improvement year 2, corrective action, restructuring - planning, restructuring - implementation). Additionally, for any Title I school identified for improvement, corrective action, or restructuring for the 2004-2005 school year, that made AYP based upon data from the 2003-2004 school year, please mark "Made AYP 2003-2004."

2. Briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring.

The Title I staff at the Montana Office of Public Instruction have worked with the identified schools in the following ways. Where district-level staff are available, they have assisted in these efforts and added their own initiatives:

- 1) Mailing of letters giving details on requirements for schools in each improvement status;
- 2) Montana Math Institute Series in conjunction with the Northwest Eisenhower Consortium for Mathematics at Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory;
- 3) "What Works in Schools" kit distribution of tapes and facilitator's guide from the Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD);
- 4) High Priority Schools and Districts Institute in conjunction with Title I State Conference;
- 5) Priority status for on-site technical assistance visits and reviews; and
- 6) Regular teleconferencing.



**Title I Schools Identified for Improvement, Corrective Action, and Restructuring**

District Name & NCES/CCD ID Code	School Name & NCES/CCD ID Code	Area(s) in which school missed AYP						School Improvement Status for SY 2004-2005
		Reading/Language Arts		Mathematics		Other Academic Indicator		
		Proficiency Target	Participation Rate	Proficiency Target	Participation Rate	Academic Indicator (elementary/middle schools)	Graduation Rate (high school)	
Anaconda Elem/3002010	Fred Moodry 7-8/00014	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	NA	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Improvement
Arlee Elem/3002220	Arlee 7-8/00900	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	NA	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Improvement
Billings Elem/3003870	Ponderosa Sch/00079	Made AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	NA	Holding at Corrective Action Year 1
Billings Elem/3003870	Riverside 7-8/00903	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	NA	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Improvement
Billings HS/3003900	Billings Sr HS/00090	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Missed AYP	Made AYP	NA	Made AYP	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Improvement
Box Elder Elem/3004440	Box Elder 7-8/00985	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Restructuring
Box Elder Elem/3004440	Box Elder Sch/00103	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Improvement
Box Elder HS/3004500	Box Elder HS/00104	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Improvement
Brockton Elem/3005010	Barbara Gilligan 7-8/01046	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	2 <sup>nd</sup> Year Identified for Restructuring
Brockton Elem/3005010	Barbara Gilligan Sch/00124	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	2 <sup>nd</sup> Year Identified for Restructuring

Brockton HS/3005040	Brockton HS/00125	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	2 <sup>nd</sup> Year Identified for Restructuring
Browning Elem/3005140	Browning Middle Sch/00872	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	NA	2 <sup>nd</sup> Year Identified for Restructuring
Browning Elem/3005140	KW Bergan Sch/00131	FEEDER	FEEDER	FEEDER	FEEDER	FEEDER	FEEDER	2 <sup>nd</sup> Year Identified for Restructuring
Browning Elem/3005140	Napi Sch/00132	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	NA	2 <sup>nd</sup> Year identified for Restructuring
Browning Elem/3005140	Vina Chattin Sch/00134	FEEDER	FEEDER	FEEDER	FEEDER	FEEDER	FEEDER	2 <sup>nd</sup> Year Identified for Restructuring
Browning HS/3005190	Browning HS/00136	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Missed AYP	Made AYP	NA	Made AYP	2 <sup>nd</sup> Year Identified for Restructuring
Butte Elem/3005280	East Middle Sch/00905	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	NA	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Improvement
Colstrip Elem/3007050	Pine Butte Elem Sch/00873	Made AYP	Made AYP	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	NA	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Improvement
Columbia Falls Elem/3007110	Columbia Falls 7-8/00195	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	NA	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Improvement
Dept of Corrections – Youth/3000091	Riverside Youth Corr Facil EI/00272	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Improvement
Dodson Elem/3009090	Dodson 7-8/01028	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Improvement
East Glacier Park Elem/3009510	East Glacier Park Sch/00267	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	Holding at Corrective Action Year 1
Frazer Elem/3011420	Frazer 7-8/01072	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	2 <sup>nd</sup> Year Identified for Restructuring
Frazer Elem/3011420	Frazer Elem/00310	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Restructuring

Frazer HS/3011460	Frazer HS/00311	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	2 <sup>nd</sup> Year Identified for Restructuring
Great Falls Elem/3013040	East Middle Sch 6-7-8/00882	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	NA	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Improvement
Hardin Elem/3013310	Crow Agency Sch/00392	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	NA	2 <sup>nd</sup> Year Identified for Restructuring
Hardin Elem/3013310	Hardin Intermediate/00395	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	NA	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Improvement
Hardin Elem/3013310	Hardin Middle Sch/00394	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	NA	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Improvement
Hardin Elem/3013310	Hardin Primary/00396	FEEDER	FEEDER	FEEDER	FEEDER	FEEDER	FEEDER	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Improvement
Hardin HS/3013340	Hardin HS/00397	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Missed AYP	Made AYP	NA	Made AYP	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Improvement
Harlem HS/3013400	Harlem HS/00400	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Missed AYP	Made AYP	NA	Missed AYP	2 <sup>nd</sup> Year Identified for Restructuring
Hays-Lodge Pole K-12 Schls/3013660	Hays-Lodge Pole 7-8/00934	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	2 <sup>nd</sup> Year Identified for Restructuring
Hays-Lodge Pole K-12 Schls/3013660	Hays-Lodge Pole HS/00413	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	2 <sup>nd</sup> Year Identified for Restructuring
Heart Butte Elem/3013740	Heart Butte 7-8/01031	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	2 <sup>nd</sup> Year Identified for Restructuring
Heart Butte Elem/3013740	Heart Butte Elem/00414	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Improvement
Heart Butte HS/3000099	Heart Butte HS/00924	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	2 <sup>nd</sup> Year Identified for Restructuring
Helena Elem/3000005	Central Sch/00418	Made AYP	Made AYP	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	NA	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Improvement

Lame Deer Elem/3016050	Lame Deer 7-8/01049	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	NA	2 <sup>nd</sup> Year Identified for Restructuring
Lame Deer Elem/3016050	Lame Deer Sch/00494	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	2 <sup>nd</sup> Year Identified for Restructuring
Lame Deer HS/3000095	Lame Deer HS/00137	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Missed AYP	Made AYP	NA	Missed AYP	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Restructuring
Lavina K-12 Schls/3016290	Lavina Sch/00502	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Improvement
Lewistown Elem/3016490	Garfield Sch/00507	Made AYP	Made AYP	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	NA	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Improvement
Lodge Grass Elem/3017010	Lodge Grass 7-8/00931	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	NA	2 <sup>nd</sup> Year Identified for Restructuring
Lodge Grass Elem/3017010	Lodge Grass Sch/00533	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	2 <sup>nd</sup> Year Identified for Restructuring
Lodge Grass HS/3017040	Lodge Grass HS/00534	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Missed AYP	Made AYP	NA	Missed AYP	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Restructuring
Missoula Elem/3018570	Porter Middle Sch/00565	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	NA	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Improvement
Plenty Coups HS/3013360	Plenty Coups HS/00398	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	2 <sup>nd</sup> Year Identified for Restructuring
Polson Elem/3021060	Polson 5-6 Sch/01087	FEEDER	FEEDER	FEEDER	FEEDER	FEEDER	FEEDER	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Improvement
Polson Elem/3021060	Polson 7-8/00632	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	NA	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Improvement
Polson HS/3021090	Polson HS/00633	Made AYP	Made AYP	Missed AYP	Missed AYP	NA	Made AYP	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Improvement
Poplar Elem/3021240	Poplar 5-6 Sch/01044	FEEDER	FEEDER	FEEDER	FEEDER	FEEDER	FEEDER	2 <sup>nd</sup> Year Identified for Restructuring

Poplar Elem/3021240	Poplar 7-8/00636	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	NA	2 <sup>nd</sup> Year Identified for Restructuring
Poplar Elem/3021240	Poplar Sch/00637	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	NA	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Improvement
Poplar HS/3021270	Poplar HS/00638	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Missed AYP	Made AYP	NA	Missed AYP	2 <sup>nd</sup> Year Identified for Restructuring
Powell County HS/3021450	Powell County HS/00641	Made AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	NA	Missed AYP	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Improvement
Pryor Elem/3021720	Pryor 7-8/00930	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Restructuring
Rocky Boy Elem/3022750	Rocky Boy 7-8/00986	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	2 <sup>nd</sup> Year Identified for Restructuring
Rocky Boy Elem/3022750	Rocky Boy Sch/00666	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	NA	2 <sup>nd</sup> Year Identified for Restructuring
Rocky Boy HS/3028911	Rocky Boy HS/01086	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	2 <sup>nd</sup> Year Identified for Restructuring
Ronan Elem/3022790	Ronan Middle Sch/00668	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	NA	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Improvement
Vaughn Elem/3005850	Vaughn 7-8/00944	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	Holding at Corrective Action Year 1
Wolf Point Elem/3028590	Northside Sch/00796	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	NA	Identified for Corrective Action
Wolf Point Elem/3028590	Southside Sch/00797	FEEDER	FEEDER	FEEDER	FEEDER	FEEDER	FEEDER	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Improvement
Wolf Point Elem/3028590	Wolf Point 7-8/00798	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	NA	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Improvement
Wolf Point HS/3028620	Wolf Point HS/00799	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Missed AYP	Made AYP	NA	Made AYP	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Improvement

Wyola Elem/3028800	Wyola Sch/00804	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	2 <sup>nd</sup> Year Identified for Restructuring
Yellowstone Academy Elem/3028860	Yellowstone Academy Elem/00806	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Improvement
SSP – Small Schools Process – a wholistic rather than factor-by-factor process								

**D. Title I Districts Identified for Improvement.**

1. In the following chart, please provide a list of Title I districts identified for improvement or corrective action under section 1116 for the 2004-2005 school year, based upon data from the 2003-2004 school year. For each district listed, please provide the areas in which the district missed AYP (e.g., missing reading proficiency target, reading participation rate, other academic indicator), and the district improvement status for the 2004-2005 school year (e.g., district in need of improvement year 1, district in need of improvement year 2, corrective action).

2 Briefly describe the measures being taken to address the achievement problems of districts identified for improvement and corrective action.

The Title I staff at the Montana Office of Public Instruction have worked with the identified schools in the following ways. Where district-level staff are available, they have assisted in these efforts and added their own initiatives:

- 1) Mailing of letters giving details on requirements for districts in each improvement status;
- 2) Montana Math Institute Series in conjunction with the Northwest Eisenhower Consortium for Mathematics at Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory;
- 3) “What Works in Schools” kit distribution of tapes and facilitator’s guide from the Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD);
- 4) High Priority Schools and Districts Institute in conjunction with Title I State Conference;
- 5) Priority status for on-site technical assistance visits and reviews; and
- 6) Regular teleconferencing.

**Title I Districts Identified for Improvement and Corrective Action**

District Name & NCES/CCD ID Code	Area(s) in which district missed AYP						District Improvement Status for SY 2004-2005
	Reading/Language Arts		Mathematics		Other Academic Indicator		
	Proficiency Target	Participation Rate	Proficiency Target	Participation Rate	Academic Indicator (elementary/middle schools)	Graduation Rate (high school)	
Arlee Elem/3002220	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	NA	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Improvement
Ashland Elem/3000008	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Improvement
Billings Elem/3003870	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	NA	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Improvement
Billings HS/3003900	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Missed AYP	Made AYP	NA	Made AYP	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Improvement
Box Elder Elem/3004440	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	NA	3 <sup>rd</sup> Year Identified for Corrective Action
Box Elder HS/3004500	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Improvement
Brockton Elem/3005010	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	3 <sup>rd</sup> Year Identified for Corrective Action
Brockton HS/3005040	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	3 <sup>rd</sup> Year Identified for Corrective Action
Browning Elem/3005140	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	NA	3 <sup>rd</sup> Year Identified for Corrective Action



Browning HS/3005190	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Missed AYP	Made AYP	NA	Made AYP	3 <sup>rd</sup> Year Identified for Corrective Action
Butte Elem/3005280	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	NA	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Improvement
Columbia Falls Elem/3007110	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	NA	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Improvement
Cut Bank Elem/3000003	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	NA	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Improvement
Dept of Corrections-Youth/3000091	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Improvement
East Glacier Park Elem/3009510	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	Holding at Corrective Action Year 1
Frazer Elem/3011420	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	3 <sup>rd</sup> Year Identified for Corrective Action
Frazer HS/3011460	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	3 <sup>rd</sup> Year Identified for Corrective Action
Great Falls Elem/3013040	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	NA	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Improvement
Hardin Elem/3013310	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	NA	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Improvement
Hardin HS/3013340	Misses AYP	Made AYP	Missed AYP	Made AYP	NA	Made AYP	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Improvement
Harlem Elem/3013395	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	NA	2 <sup>nd</sup> Year Identified for Corrective Action
Harlem HS/3013400	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Missed AYP	Made AYP	NA	Missed AYP	3 <sup>rd</sup> Year Identified for Corrective Action

Harlowton Elem/3013440	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	NA	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Improvement
Havre Elem/3013560	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	NA	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Improvement
Hays-Lodge Pole K-12 Schls/3013660	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	NA	3 <sup>rd</sup> Year Identified for Corrective Action
Heart Butte Elem/3013740	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	3 <sup>rd</sup> Year Identified for Corrective Action
Heart Butte HS/3000099	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	3 <sup>rd</sup> Year Identified for Corrective Action
Helena Elem/3000005	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	NA	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Improvement
Huntley Project K-12 Schls/3014700	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Improvement
Kalispell Elem/3015450	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	NA	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Improvement
Lame Deer Elem/3016050	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	NA	3 <sup>rd</sup> Year Identified for Corrective Action
Lame Deer HS/3000095	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Missed AYP	Made AYP	NA	Missed AYP	2 <sup>nd</sup> Year Identified for Corrective Action
Laurel Elem/3016200	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	NA	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Improvement
Lockwood Elem/3016950	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	NA	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Improvement

Lodge Grass Elem/3017010	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	NA	3 <sup>rd</sup> Year Identified for Corrective Action
Lodge Grass HS/3017040	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Missed AYP	Made AYP	NA	Missed AYP	2 <sup>nd</sup> Year Identified for Corrective Action
Miles City Elem/3018410	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	NA	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Improvement
Missoula Elem/3018570	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	NA	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Improvement
Missoula HS/3018540	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	NA	Made AYP	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Improvement
Plenty Coups HS/3013360	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	3 <sup>rd</sup> Year Identified for Corrective Action
Polson Elem/3021060	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	NA	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Improvement
Polson HS/3021090	Made AYP	Made AYP	Missed AYP	Missed AYP	NA	Made AYP	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Improvement
Poplar Elem/3021240	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	NA	3 <sup>rd</sup> Year Identified for Corrective Action
Poplar HS/3021270	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Missed AYP	Made AYP	NA	Missed AYP	3 <sup>rd</sup> Year Identified for Corrective Action
Powell County HS/3021450	Made AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	NA	Missed AYP	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Improvement
Pryor Elem/3021720	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	2 <sup>nd</sup> Year Identified for Corrective Action

Rocky Boy Elem/3022750	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	NA	3 <sup>rd</sup> Year Identified for Corrective Action
Rocky Boy HS/3028911	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	3 <sup>rd</sup> Year Identified for Corrective Action
Ronan Elem/3022790	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	NA	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Improvement
Seeley Lake Elem/3023730	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	NA	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Improvement
St Regis K-12 Schls/3024930	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Missed AYP	Missed AYP	Made AYP	NA	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Improvement
Wolf Point Elem/3028590	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Made AYP	NA	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Improvement
Wolf Point HS/3028620	Missed AYP	Made AYP	Missed AYP	Made AYP	NA	Made AYP	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Improvement
Wyola Elem/3028800	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	3 <sup>rd</sup> Year Identified for Corrective Action
Yellowstone Academy Elem/3028860	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	SSP	1 <sup>st</sup> Year Identified for Improvement
SSP – Small Schools Process – a wholistic rather than factor-by-factor process							

## E. PUBLIC SCHOOL CHOICE AND SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

### 1. Public School Choice

1. Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring from which students transferred under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2003-2004 school year. \_\_\_\_1\_\_\_\_

2. Please provide the number of public schools to which students transferred under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2003-2004 school year. \_\_\_\_6\_\_\_\_ How many of these schools were charter schools? \_\_\_\_0\_\_\_\_

3. Please provide the number of students who transferred to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2003-2004 school year. \_\_\_\_14\_\_\_\_

4. Please provide the number of students who were eligible to transfer to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2003-2004 school year. \_\_\_\_387\_\_\_\_

**Optional Information:** If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:

1. The number of students who applied to transfer to another public school under the provisions for public school choice under section 1116 of Title I during the 2003-2004 school year. \_\_\_\_14\_\_\_\_

2. The number of students, among those who applied to transfer to another public school under the Title I public school choice provisions, who were actually offered the opportunity to transfer by their LEAs, during the 2003-2004 school year. \_\_\_\_14\_\_\_\_

### 2. Supplemental Educational Services

1. Please provide the number of Title I schools identified for improvement, corrective action, and restructuring whose students received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2003-2004 school year. \_\_\_\_1\_\_\_\_

2. Please provide the number of students who received supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2003-2004 school year. \_\_\_\_10\_\_\_\_

3. Please provide the number of students who were eligible to receive supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2003-2004 school year. 5,482

**Optional Information:** If the State has the following data, the Department would be interested in knowing the following:

1. The number of students who applied to receive supplemental educational services under section 1116 of Title I during the 2003-2004 school year. Unknown

## **V. TEACHER and PARAPROFESIONAL QUALITY**

**A. Highly Qualified Teachers.** NCLB places a major emphasis upon teacher quality as a factor in improving student achievement. The new Title II programs focus on preparing, training, and recruiting high-quality teachers and principals and requires States to develop plans with annual measurable objectives that will ensure that all teachers teaching in core academic subjects are highly qualified by the end of the 2005-2006 school year.

The requirement that teachers be highly qualified, as defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA, applies to public elementary and secondary school teachers teaching in core academic subjects. (The term “core academic subjects” means English, reading or language arts, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history, and geography (*Section 9101(11)*)). For more detailed information on highly qualified teachers, please refer to the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/programs/teacherqual/guidance.doc>

1. In the following table, please provide data from the 2003-2004 school year for classes in the core academic subjects being taught by “highly qualified” teachers (as the term is defined in Section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate and in “high-poverty” and “low-poverty” schools (as the terms are defined in Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA). Section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) defines “high-poverty” schools as schools in the top quartile of poverty in the State and “low-poverty” schools as schools in the bottom quartile of poverty in the State. Additionally, please provide information on classes being taught by highly qualified teachers by the elementary and secondary school level.

School Type	Total Number of Core Academic Classes	Number of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers	Percentage of Core Academic Classes Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers
All Schools in State	22,725	22,458	98.8
<b>By Poverty Status</b>			
High-Poverty Schools	3,995	3,930	98.4
Low-Poverty Schools	4,687	4,627	98.7
<b>By Level</b>			
Elementary	11,379	11,298	99.3
Secondary	11,346	11,160	98.4

2. Please report the State poverty quartile breaks for high- and low-poverty schools used in the table above.

	High-Poverty Schools	Low-Poverty Schools
State Poverty Quartile Breaks	More than <u>74</u> %	Less than <u>26</u> %
Poverty Metric Used	Free and reduced lunch	

3. Please provide the State’s definition of elementary and secondary school level as used in the chart above.

a. Elementary Level: **K-8**

b. Secondary Level: **9-12**



**B. High-Quality Professional Development.** In the following chart, please provide data from the 2003-2004 school year the percentage of teachers receiving high-quality professional development. The term “high-quality professional development” means professional development that meets the criteria outlined in the definition of professional development in Title IX, Section 9101(34) of ESEA. The data for this element should include all public elementary and secondary school teachers in the State.

For more detailed information on high-quality professional development, please refer to the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/programs/teacherqual/guidance.doc>

	<b>Percentage of Teachers Receiving High-Quality Professional Development</b>
2003-2004 School Year	<b>100%</b>

According to Montana law and administrative rule, Montana teachers are required to participate in approved professional development activities each year. See attached Administrative Rules of Montana 10.65.102 Policy governing pupil instruction-related days approved for base funding program calculations and 10.55.714 Professional Development.

School Laws of Montana 20-1-304. Pupil-instruction-related day. A pupil-instruction related day is a day of teacher activities devoted to improving the quality of instruction. The activities may include, but are not limited to, in-service training, attending state meetings of teacher organizations, and conducting parent conferences. A maximum of 7 pupil-instruction-related days may be conducted during a school year, with a minimum of 3 days for instructional and professional development meetings or other appropriate in-service training, if the days are planned in accordance with the policy adopted by the board of public education. The days may not be included as a part of the required minimum of 180 days or the required minimum aggregate days.

The Montana Office of Public Instruction annually gathers district and school data to meet professional development requirements for PIR days and reports results to the Montana Legislature, the Board of Public Education, the Superintendent of Public Instruction, the U.S. Department of Education, and other federal agencies. The Montana Annual Data Collection is mechanism used to collect information from districts and schools on the professional development plans for the current academic year. The 2003-2004 data is available on the OPI web site at [www.opi.mt.gov](http://www.opi.mt.gov).

In addition to participating in the required three-days of professional development activities for PIR days, licensed teachers in five-year increments must earn renewal units that are planned and structured; of benefit to the license holder’s professional development; and an exposure to a new

idea or skill or an extension of an existing idea or skill; or the instruction of a relevant higher education course, based upon the academic credit of the course, by a Montana license holder who has achieved a graduate degree in an endorsed field of specialization; or the completion of the assessment process for national board licensure, or renewal of national board licensure, through the national board for professional teaching standards. See Administrative Rules of Montana 10.57.215 - 10.57.216.

Providers of professional development activities, which offer acceptable renewal unit activities for license renewal, are: state, regional or national accredited college and university programs; accredited school districts; professional organizations and government agencies; and independent contractors. With the exception of colleges and universities, the superintendent of public instruction approves all other providers for professional development activities. The superintendent of public instruction provides annually a report to the board of public education on the status of the professional development activities offered in the state of Montana. All approved provider professional development activities are posted on the OPI eCalendar at [www.opi.mt.gov](http://www.opi.mt.gov).

**C. Paraprofessional Quality.** NCLB defines a qualified paraprofessional as an employee who provides instructional support in a program supported by Title I, Part A funds who has (1) completed two years of study at an institution of higher education; (2) obtained an associate’s (or higher) degree; or (3) met a rigorous standard of quality and be able to demonstrate, through a formal State or local academic assessment, knowledge of and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics (or, as appropriate, reading readiness, writing readiness, and mathematics readiness) (Section 1119(c) and (d).) For more information on qualified paraprofessionals, please refer to the Title I paraprofessionals Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/paraguidance.doc>

In the following chart, please provide data from the 2003-2004 school year for the percentage of Title I paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified.

Baseline Data and Targets	Percentage of Qualified Title I Paraprofessionals
2003-2004 School Year	42.62

## **VI. English Language Proficiency**

### **A. English Language Proficiency (ELP) Standards**

**Please provide an updated description of the State's progress since September 1, 2003, in developing and implementing ELP standards as required under section 3113(b)(2). Please describe the progress the State has made in linking the ELP standards to academic content in reading/language arts and mathematics. Provide a description of the State's progress in developing ELP standards that are linked to academic content in science. Specifically, describe how the State's ELP standards:**

- **Address grades K through 12**
- **Address the four domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing**

#### **STATE RESPONSE**

Montana is a member of the Mountain West Consortium, which was a recipient of an enhanced assessment grant to develop an English language proficiency assessment that would comply with the requirements of No Child Left Behind. In conjunction with the development of the assessment, the consortium conducted a review of the English language arts/communication arts standards in each of the member states to identify common standards. These standards served as the foundation document for the assessment, thus providing for alignment with the language arts/communication arts standards of the member states. The ELP standards address Kindergarten through 12<sup>th</sup> grade. The standards and assessment are based on a construct of language acquisition that addresses vocabulary, syntax, discourse, and function in the four modes of listening, speaking, reading and writing. The standards and assessment are linked to reading, math, social studies and science through vocabulary and functions in the content areas, such as comparing/contrasting, cause and effect, identification of main idea, etc. A task force of Montana educators will conduct a final review of the draft standards in the spring of 2005 before the first administration of the ELP assessment.

## B. English Language Proficiency (ELP) Assessments

1. Please describe how the State ensures:
  - The annual assessment of all LEP students in the State in grades K-12;
  - The ELP assessment(s) address the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension
2. If the State is using multiple ELP assessments, please describe how the State:
  - Set technical criteria for the assessments (validity and reliability);
  - Ensured the assessments are equivalent to one another in their content, difficulty, and quality;
  - Reviewed and approved each assessment; and
  - Ensured that data from all assessments can be aggregated for comparison and reporting purposes as well as disaggregated by ELP levels and grade levels
3. Please provide an updated description, including a timeline, of the State's progress in developing and implementing new or enhanced ELP assessment(s) that are aligned with the State's English language proficiency standards as required by section 3113(b)(2)(C)(iii).

### STATE RESPONSE

Montana has fulfilled the provisions of the 2001 compliance agreement that included the transition from assessments that were not aligned to state standards in math, reading, and English language proficiency to a criterion-referenced test in math and reading and a statewide assessment of the four domains for English language proficiency. Montana is in the process of developing a system for the administration of the new ELP assessment, which will mirror the system in place for the current statewide assessment in math and reading. Currently an RFP is being developed for the multi-state scoring and reporting of the ELP assessment. In the fall of each school year, all school districts in the State provide enrollment data that includes the number of LEP students in each grade level. The districts that indicate that they serve LEP students will all be included in the roster of districts for the ELP assessment. The corresponding numbers of LEP students in the grade levels for the statewide math and reading subgroups will be checked for discrepancies.

The Mountain West Consortium assessment has been completed. There are 2 secure forms available for use, one of which was delivered on January 15 from the partner developer, Measured Progress, with the 2<sup>nd</sup> form to be delivered on February 15. There will be a meeting of all Title III subgrantees in conjunction with the statewide Title I conference on February 23, 2005, in Great Falls to provide an update on the status of the assessment and get districts' input in issues regarding its implementation, including the determination of a testing window.

### C. English Language Proficiency Assessment Data

In the following tables, please provide English language proficiency (ELP) data from the **2003-2004** school year test administration. English language proficiency data should include **all** students in the State who were assessed and identified as limited English proficient by State-selected English language proficiency assessments. The State must also disaggregate ELP data by number and percentage of students who participated in Title III programs.

Montana does not currently have a statewide student database which permits tracking and collecting data on individual students. For purposes of this performance report, Montana is able to report on the performance of LEP students in grades 4, 8 and 11 on the ITBS in 2004.

The data does not correspond with the LEP students served in Title III programs because that disaggregates sub-category was not available in the '04 or '03 results. In the next administration of both the new ELP assessment and the math and reading criterion-referenced assessment, LEP students receiving Title III services will be coded, and thus the data will be available.

The ELP data should be aggregated at the State level and should include the following:

1. Total number and percentage of **all** students assessed for limited English proficiency ("assessed" refers to the number of students referred for assessment and evaluated using State-selected ELP assessments) **1,061**
2. Total number and percentage of **all** students identified as LEP by each State-selected ELP assessment(s) ("identified" refers to the number of students determined to be LEP on State-selected ELP assessments) **6,427**
3. Total number and percentage of **all** students identified as LEP at each level of English language proficiency as defined by State-selected ELP assessment(s). **We do not have data on individual levels of proficiency.**
4. Total number and percentage of students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program during the 2003-2004 school year. **3,906**
5. Total number and percentage of students who participated in a Title III language instruction educational program during the 2003-2004 school year and who were transitioned into a classroom not tailored for LEP children and are no longer receiving services under Title III. **83 or 14%**
6. Total number and percentage of LEP students at each level of English language proficiency who received Title III services during the 2003-2004 school year. **There were a total of 3,906 LEP students who received services; we do not have data identifying their levels of proficiency.**

States may use the sample formats below or another format to report the requested information.

**Table C-1: Refers to English Language Proficiency Assessment Data Items 1, 2, and 3 on the previous page**

<b>2003-2004 Data for ALL LEP Students in the State</b>												
Name of LEP Assessment(s)  (1)	Total number and percentage of ALL Students Assessed  (2)		Total number and percentage of ALL students identified as LEP  (3)		Total number and percentage of ALL students identified as LEP at each level of English language proficiency							
					Number and Percentage at Basic or <b>Level 1</b>  (4)		Number and Percentage at Intermediate or <b>Level 2</b>  (5)		Number and Percentage at Advanced or <b>Level 3</b>  (6)		Number and Percentage at Proficient or <b>Level 4</b>  (7)	
<b>ITBS</b>	<b>1,061</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>6,427</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>472</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>312</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>251</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>2%</b>

**Table C-2: Refers to English Language Proficiency Assessment Data Items 4, 5, and 6 on the previous page**

2003-2004 Data for LEP Students in the State Served under Title III												
Name of LEP Assessment(s)  (1)	Total number and percentage of students identified as LEP who participated in Title III programs  (2)		Total number and percentage of Title III LEP students transitioned for 2 year monitoring  (3)		Total number and percentage of Title III students identified at each level of English language proficiency							
					Number and Percentage at Basic or <b>Level 1</b>  (4)		Number and Percentage at Intermediate or <b>Level 2</b>  (5)		Number and Percentage at Advanced or <b>Level 3</b>  (6)		Number and Percentage at Proficient or <b>Level 4</b>  (7)	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%



**D. Immigrant Children and Youth Data**

Please provide the following information required under Section 3111(c).

1. Number of immigrant children and youth reported in 2003-2004    \_\_\_ 348 \_\_\_
2. Number of immigrant children and youth served in 2003-2004    \_\_\_ 43 \_\_\_
3. Number of subgrants awarded to LEAs for immigrant children  
and youth programs for 2003-2004    \_\_\_ 1 \_\_\_

**E. Definition of Proficient**

**If the State has made changes since the September 1, 2003 Consolidated State Application submission, please provide the State’s definition of “proficient” in English as defined by the State’s English language proficiency standards and assessments as defined in section 3122(a)(3). Please include in your response:**

- **The test score range or cut scores for each of the State’s ELP assessments**
- **A description of how the five domains of listening, speaking, reading, writing, and comprehension are incorporated or weighted in the State’s definition of “proficient” in English**
- **Other criteria used to determine attaining proficiency in English**

**STATE RESPONSE**

Montana has not made changes during the period of the compliance agreement. With the transition to the new assessment, a new definition will be developed. With the implementation of the new English language proficiency assessment, there will be a standards setting that will determine the cut scores for the five domains. The standard setting process will include the determination of how the five domains will be incorporated into the definition of proficient.

## F. Definition of Making Progress

**If the State has made changes since the September 1, 2003 Consolidated State Application submission, please provide the State’s definition of “making progress” in learning English in Title III served schools as defined by the State’s English language proficiency standards and assessments as defined in section 3122(a)(3). Please include in your response:**

- **A description of the English language proficiency levels and any sub-levels as defined by the State’s English language proficiency standards and assessments**
- **A description of the criteria students must meet to progress from one proficiency level to the next (e.g., narrative descriptions, cut scores, formula, data from multiple sources)**
- **A description of the language domains in which students must make progress in moving from one English language proficiency level to the next**

### **STATE RESPONSE**

Montana has not made changes during the period of the compliance agreement. As noted in E above, with the implementation of the new English language proficiency assessment, a definition of making progress in accordance with the proficiency levels and cut scores, will be determined.

**G. Definition of Cohort**

**If the State has made changes since the September 1, 2003 Consolidated State Application submission, please provide the State’s definition of “cohort.” Include a description of the specific characteristics of the cohort(s) in the State, e.g., grade/grade span or other characteristics.**

**STATE RESPONSE**

Montana has not made changes during the period of the compliance agreement. For the accountability system with the new ELP assessment, a determination of cohorts will be developed.

**H. Information on the Acquisition of English Language Proficiency for ALL Limited English Proficient Students in the State.**

Please provide information on the progress made by **ALL LEP students in your State** in learning English and attaining English language proficiency.

Data from the assessments has not been adequate to allow an analysis of attainment of the Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives. Montana does not currently have a statewide student database which permits tracking and collecting data on individual students. For purposes of this report, Montana is able to report on the performance of LEP students in grades 4, 8, and 11 on the ITBS. This data does not correspond exactly with the LEP students served with Title III funds because that disaggregated sub-category is not available in the '03 nor '04 results. The accurate identification of limited English proficiency, particularly among American Indian students, is an ongoing process that the SEA has made a priority. The current assessment data from the spring '03 and '04 administration indicates that the 4<sup>th</sup> grade LEP student group increased from 26 to 32% proficient and advanced, the 8<sup>th</sup> grade LEP group increased from 18 to 21% proficient and advanced, and the 11<sup>th</sup> grade LEP group decreased from 33 to 26% proficient and advanced. In the next administration of both the new statewide English language proficiency assessment and the math and reading criterion-referenced assessment, LEP students receiving Title III services will be coded, and thus that data set will be available. With the new English language proficiency assessment, the SEA will design a system that will generate the required data in a reliable form to be collected and reported at the state level.

Did your State apply the Title III English language proficiency annual measurable achievement objectives (AMAOs) to **ALL LEP** students in the State?

Yes                       No

If yes, you may use the format provided below to report the requested information. If no, please describe the different evaluation mechanism used by the State to measure both the progress of ALL LEP students in learning English and in attaining English language proficiency. and provide the data from that evaluation.

English Language Proficiency	Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Made Progress in Learning English				Percent and Number of ALL LEP Students in the State Who Attained English Proficiency			
	Projected		Actual		Projected		Actual	
2003-2004 School Year	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#

**I. Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives for English Language Proficiency for Title III Participants**

As indicated in H above, the current data available does not provide information on the LEP students served in Title III.

Please provide the State's progress in meeting performance targets/annual measurable achievement objectives in LEAs served by Title III

**\*Unit of Analysis/Cohort:** \_\_\_\_\_

(Note: States should specify the defining characteristics of each cohort addressed, e.g., grades/grade spans)

States may use the sample format below or another format to report the requested information.

English Language Proficiency	Percent and Number of Title III LEP Students in the State Who Made Progress in Learning English				Percent and Number of Title III LEP Students in the State Who Attained English Proficiency			
	Projected		Actual		Projected		Actual	
2003-2004 School Year	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#

**J. Please provide the following data on Title III Programs for the 2003-2004 School Year**

1. Number of Title III subgrants \_\_\_\_\_ 13 \_\_\_\_\_
2. Number of Title III subgrants that met Title III annual measurable achievement objectives \_\_\_\_\_
3. Number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet Title III annual measurable achievement objectives \_\_\_\_\_
4. Number of Title III subgrantees that did not meet Title III annual measurable achievement objectives Due to large increases in the number of LEP Immigrant students \_\_\_\_\_

As explained above in H, the available data was not adequate to determine an analysis of attainment of the AMAOs. With the implementation of the new ELP assessment, Montana will have new baseline data, establish new AMAOs and develop an accountability system that clearly indicates school that have met or not met the AMAOs.

**VII. Persistently Dangerous Schools**

In the following chart, please provide data for the number of schools identified as persistently dangerous as determined by the State by the start of the 2004-2005 school year. For further guidance on persistently dangerous schools, please refer to the Unsafe School Choice Option Non-Regulatory Guidance, available at:

<http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/unsafeschoolchoice.doc>

	<b>Number of Persistently Dangerous Schools</b>
2004-2005 School Year	<b>0</b>

## **VIII. Graduation and Dropout Rates**

### **A. Graduation Rates**

Section 200.19 of the Title I regulations issued under the No Child Left Behind Act on December 2, 2002, defines graduation rate to mean:

- The percentage of students, measured from the beginning of high school, who graduate from public high school with a regular diploma (not including a GED or any other diploma not fully aligned with the State's academic standards) in the standard number of years; or,
- Another more accurate definition developed by the State and approved by the Secretary in the State plan that more accurately measures the rate of students who graduate from high school with a regular diploma; and
- Avoids counting a dropout as a transfer.

1. The Secretary approved each State's definition of the graduation rate, consistent with section 200.19 of the Title I regulations, as part of each State's accountability plan. Using the definition of the graduation rate that was approved as part of your State's accountability plan, in the following chart please provide graduation rate data for the 2002-2003 school year.

2. For those States that are reporting transitional graduation rate data and are working to put into place data collection systems that will allow the State to calculate the graduation rate in accordance with Section 200.19 for all the required subgroups, please provide a detailed progress report on the status of those efforts.



**GRADUATION RATE**

<b>High School Graduates</b>	<b>Graduation Rate</b>
Student Group	02-03 School Year
All Students	83.9
American Indian/Alaska Native	58.2
Asian/Pacific Islander	89.3 Asian/81.8 PI
Black, non-Hispanic	80.8
Hispanic	77.8
White, non-Hispanic	86.5
Students with Disabilities	N/A
Limited English Proficient	N/A
Economically Disadvantaged	N/A
Migrant	N/A
Male	83.4
Female	86.5

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

## B. Dropout Rate

For purposes of calculating and reporting a dropout rate for this performance indicator, States should use the annual event school dropout rate for students leaving a school in a single year determined in accordance with the National Center for Education Statistics' (NCES) Common Core of Data.

Consistent with this requirement, States must use NCES' definition of "high school dropout," An individual who: 1) was enrolled in school at some time during the previous school year; and 2) was not enrolled at the beginning of the current school year; and 3) has not graduated from high school or completed a state- or district-approved educational program; and 4) does not meet any of the following exclusionary conditions: a) transfer to another public school district, private school, or state- or district approved educational program (including correctional or health facility programs); b) temporary absence due to suspension or school-excused illness; or c) death.

In the following chart, please provide data for the 2002-2003 school year for the percentage of students who drop out of high school, disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged.

### DROPOUT RATE

<b>Dropouts</b>	<b>Dropout Rate</b>
Student Group	02-03 School Year
All Students	3.6
American Indian/Alaska Native	8.1
Asian/Pacific Islander	1.4
Black, non-Hispanic	3.8
Hispanic	6.0
White, non-Hispanic	3.1
Students with Disabilities	N/A
Limited English Proficient	N/A
Economically Disadvantaged	N/A
Migrant	N/A
Male	3.8
Female	3.4

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

## **CONSOLIDATED STATE PERFORMANCE REPORT: PART II**

For reporting on  
**School Year 2003-2004**



**PART II DUE APRIL 15, 2005**

**I. Improving Basic Programs  
Operated by Local Educational Agencies (Title I, Part A)**

**A. Student Achievement and High-Poverty Schools**

1. Please provide the number of public schools with poverty rates of 40% or greater reporting an increase in the number of students performing at the proficient or advanced levels of student achievement in **reading/language arts** as measured by State assessments administered in the 2003-2004 school year as compared to assessments administered in the 2002-2003 school year. **Montana changed tests from an NRT to a new CRT between these two years. Therefore, this comparison is not valid.**

2. Please provide the number of public schools with poverty rates of 40% or greater reporting an increase in the number of students performing at the proficient or advanced levels of student achievement in **mathematics** as measured by State assessments administered in the 2003-2004 school year as compared to assessments administered in the 2002-2003 school year. **Montana changed tests from an NRT to a new CRT between these two years. Therefore, this comparison is not valid.**

**B. Title I, Part A Schools by Type of Program**

For the 2003-2004 school year, please provide the following:

- |   |         |
|---|---------|
| 1. Total Number of Title I schools in the State                     | __679__ |
| 2. Total Number of Title I Targeted Assistance Schools in the State | __525__ |
| 3. Total Number of Title I Schoolwide Program Schools in the State  | __154__ |

**C. Title I, Part A Student Participation****1. Student Participation in Title I, Part A by Special Services/Programs and Racial/Ethnic Groups**

In the following tables, please provide the *unduplicated* number of children participating in Title I, Part A in the State by special services/programs and racial/ethnic groups during the 2003-2004 school year. Count a child only once (*unduplicated* count) in each category even if the child participated during more than one term or in more than one school or district in the State during the reporting period. Include students in both Title I schoolwide and targeted assistance programs.

<b>Student Participation in Title I, A by Special Services or Programs 2003-2004 School Year</b>	
	Number of Students Served
Students with Disabilities	<b>5,841</b>
Limited English Proficient	<b>4,421</b>
Homeless	<b>306</b>
Migrant	<b>111</b>

<b>Student Participation in Title I, A by Racial or Ethnic Group 2003-2004 School Year</b>	
	Number of Students Served
American Indian/Alaskan Native	<b>12,041</b>
Asian/Pacific Islander	<b>336</b>
Black, non-Hispanic	<b>459</b>
Hispanic	<b>1,275</b>
White, non-Hispanic	<b>32,432</b>

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

**2. Student Participation in Title I, Part A by Grade Level**

Title I, Part A student participation counts by grade and by public, private and local neglected should be reported as *unduplicated* counts. Please enter the number of participants by grade in Title I public targeted assistance programs (TAS), Title I schoolwide *programs* (SWP), private school students participating in Title I programs, and students served in Part A local neglected programs during the 2003-2004 school year.

<b>Student Participation in Title I, Part A by Grade Level 2003-2004 School Year</b>						
	<b>Public TAS</b>	<b>Public SWP</b>	<b>Private</b>	<b>Local Neglected</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Percent of Total</b>
<b>Age 0-2</b>						
<b>Age 3-5</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>205</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>419</b>	<b>.9</b>
<b>K</b>	<b>1,030</b>	<b>2,868</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>3,964</b>	<b>8.3</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>1,627</b>	<b>3,125</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>4,855</b>	<b>10.2</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>1,585</b>	<b>3,032</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>4,714</b>	<b>9.9</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>1,512</b>	<b>3,012</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>4,625</b>	<b>9.7</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>1,498</b>	<b>2,988</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>4,578</b>	<b>9.6</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>1,346</b>	<b>3,203</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>4,645</b>	<b>9.8</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>1,382</b>	<b>2,507</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>3,997</b>	<b>8.4</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>1,597</b>	<b>1,743</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>3,421</b>	<b>7.2</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>1,537</b>	<b>1,690</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3,258</b>	<b>6.8</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>1,988</b>	<b>1,103</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>3,155</b>	<b>6.6</b>
<b>10</b>	<b>1,347</b>	<b>1,098</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>2,483</b>	<b>5.2</b>
<b>11</b>	<b>935</b>	<b>933</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>1,896</b>	<b>4.0</b>
<b>12</b>	<b>623</b>	<b>776</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>1,415</b>	<b>3.0</b>
<b>Ungraded</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>.4</b>
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>18,207</b>	<b>28,419</b>	<b>680</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>47,606</b>	<b>100</b>

### 3. Student Participation in Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs by Instructional and Support Services

In the following chart, please provide the number of students receiving instructional and support services funded by Title I, A in targeted assistance (TAS) programs during the 2003-2004 school year.

<b>Student Participation in Title I, A Targeted Assistance (TAS) Programs by Instructional and Support Services 2003-2004 School Year</b>	
<b>Instructional Services</b>	
	Number of Students Served
Mathematics	<b>10,376</b>
Reading/Language Arts	<b>13,567</b>
Science	<b>1,026</b>
Social Studies	<b>1,084</b>
Vocational/Career	
Other (specify) Study Skills	<b>3,942</b>
<b>Support Services</b>	
Health, Dental, and Eye Care	<b>295</b>
Supporting Guidance/Advocacy	<b>1,074</b>
Other (specify) Speech	<b>153</b>

### C. Staff Information for Title I, Part A Targeted Assistance Programs

In the following chart, please provide the number of full-time equivalent (FTE) staff funded through Title I, A targeted assistance (TAS) programs during the 2003-2004 school year by job category. For administrators and supervisors who service both targeted assistance and schoolwide programs, report the FTE attributable to their TAS duties only.

<b>Staff Information for Title I, A Targeted Assistance Programs 2003-2004 School Year</b>	
	Number of Title I Targeted Assistance Program FTE Staff
Administrators (non-clerical)	<b>17.964</b>
Teachers	<b>423.011</b>
Teacher Aides	<b>336.13</b>
Support Staff (clerical and non-clerical)	<b>65.769</b>
Other (specify) Material's Clerk	<b>8.045</b>

**II. William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Programs  
(Title I, Part B, Subpart 3)**

**A. Subgrants and Even Start Program Participants**

For the 2003-2004 school year, please provide the following information:

**1. Federally Funded Even Start Subgrants in the State**

a. Number of federally funded Even Start subgrants in the State  
\_\_\_8\_\_\_

**2. Even Start Families Participating  
("Participating" means participating in all applicable core services.)**

a. Total number of families served  
\_\_\_247\_\_\_

b. Total number of adults participating  
("Adults" includes teen parents.)  
\_\_\_249\_\_\_

c. Total number of adults who are English language learners  
\_\_\_10\_\_\_

d. Total number of children participating  
\_\_\_320\_\_\_

**3. Characteristics of newly enrolled families at the time of enrollment**

(A newly enrolled family means a family who is enrolled for the first time in Even Start at any time during the year.)

a. Number of newly enrolled families  
\_\_\_155\_\_\_

b. Number of newly enrolled adult participants  
\_\_\_156\_\_\_

c. Percent of newly enrolled families at or below the  
Federal Poverty level  
\_\_\_95%\_\_\_

d. Percent of newly enrolled adult participants without a



high school diploma or GED  
\_\_\_87%\_\_\_

e. Percent of newly enrolled adult participants who have  
not gone beyond the 9th grade  
\_\_\_35%\_\_\_

**4. Percent of families that have remained in the program**

(Include families that are newly enrolled and those that are continuing.)

a. From 0 to 3 months  
\_\_\_7%\_\_\_

b. From 4 to 6 months  
\_\_\_10%\_\_\_

c. From 7 to 12 months  
\_\_\_26%\_\_\_

d. More than 12 months  
\_\_\_57%\_\_\_

**B. State Even Start Performance Indicators**

Using the format of the table below, describe the State's progress in meeting its performance indicators developed under section 1240 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). Include all State indicators, as developed under section 1240, including both required and optional indicators. Provide any targets set, measures used and results for each indicator, as well as an assessment and explanation of progress. For targets with no set targets or standards, provide a descriptive assessment of progress. For indicators with more than one year of available data, please note the data in the results column and include trend information in the assessment of progress. Please indicate where data are not yet available.

<b>Indicator</b> <i>Name of required or optional indicator</i>	<b>Target or Standards</b> <i>Description of target or standard set by State of desired performance on indicator</i>	<b>Measure</b> <i>Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator</i>	<b>Result</b> <i>Data for the current reporting year and trend data where available</i>	<b>Assessment of Progress</b> <i>Status of progress on indicator (1) Target met (2) Target not met</i>	<b>Explanation of Progress</b> <i>Description of why results were obtained</i>
EXAMPLE: Adult achievement in reading, writing, English language acquisition, problem solving and numeracy	EXAMPLE: 75% of adult learners will make a grade-level gain over a program year	EXAMPLE: Tests of Adult Basic Education (TABE)	EXAMPLE: 2001-2002: 45% of adult participants met target  2002-2003: 50% of adult participants met target	EXAMPLE: Target was not met in 2002-2003, but positive movement toward target was seen between 2001-2002 and 2002-2003.	EXAMPLE: Information on participation showed that only 50% of adult participants stayed in the program for 12 months. Participants who remained in the program for at least one full year were more likely to meet target. Of participants who remained in program for one full year, 70% met target as compared to only 40% of participants who remained in program for less than 12 months.

Indicator	Target or Standard	Measure	Result	Assessment of Progress	Explanation of Progress
Adult Achievement in reading, writing, English language acquisition, problem solving & numeracy	<b>A.1.1:</b> At least 25% of Beginning Literacy Students (ABE Level 1) will demonstrate at or above specified test scale score gains of at least one literacy level after completing at least 12 hours of ABE instruction after date of enrollment until end of the Program's Fiscal Year.	TABE-R (Forms 7/8 Reading).  (Pre- and Post-Test sequence appropriate to student category.)	2003-2004: <b>33.3</b>  2002-2003: <b>83%</b>  2001-2002: <b>63%</b>	2003-2004: <b>YES</b>  2002-2003: <b>YES</b>  2001-2002: <b>YES</b>	2003-2004: Pilot of State Reporting Software 2001-2002 Pilot of State Performance Indicators
Adult Achievement in reading, writing, English language acquisition, problem solving & numeracy	<b>A.1.2:</b> At least 25% of Beginning ABE Students (ABE Level 2) will demonstrate at or above specified test scale score gains of at least one literacy level after completing at least 12 hours of ABE instruction after date of enrollment until end of the Program's Fiscal Year.	TABE-R (Forms 7/8 Reading).  (Pre- and Post-Test sequence appropriate to student category.)	2003-2004: <b>42.9%</b>  2002-2003: <b>47%</b>  2001-2002: <b>44%</b>	2003-2004: <b>YES</b>  2002-2003: <b>YES</b>  2001-2002: <b>YES</b>	
Adult Achievement in reading, writing, English language acquisition, problem solving & numeracy	<b>A.1.3:</b> At least 45% of Low Intermediate ABE Students (ABE Level 3) will demonstrate at or above specified test scale score gains of at least one literacy level after completing at least 12 hours of ABE instruction after date of enrollment until end of the Program's Fiscal Year.	TABE-R (Forms 7/8 Reading).  (Pre- and Post-Test sequence appropriate to student category.)	2003-2004: <b>45.5%</b>  2002-2003: <b>65%</b>  2001-2002: <b>43%</b>	2003-2004: <b>YES</b>  2002-2003: <b>YES</b>  2001-2002: <b>NO</b>	
Adult Achievement in reading, writing, English language acquisition, problem solving & numeracy	<b>A.1.4:</b> At least 45% of High Intermediate ABE Students (ABE Level 4) will demonstrate at or above specified test scale score gains of at least one literacy level after completing at least 12 hours of ABE instruction after date of enrollment until end of the Program's Fiscal Year.	TABE-R (Forms 7/8 Reading).  (Pre- and Post-Test sequence appropriate to student category.)	2003-2004: <b>30.6%</b>  2002-2003: <b>71%</b>  2001-2002: <b>56%</b>	2003-2004: <b>NO</b>  2002-2003: <b>YES</b>  2001-2002: <b>YES</b>	
Adult Achievement in reading, writing, English language acquisition, problem solving & numeracy	<b>A.1.5:</b> At least 60% of Low Advanced ASE Students will demonstrate at or above specified test scale score gains of at least one literacy level after completing at least 12 hours of ABE instruction after date of enrollment until end of the Program's Fiscal Year.	TABE-R (Forms 7/8 Reading).  (Pre- and Post-Test sequence appropriate to student category.)	2003-2004: <b>22.2%</b>  2002-2003: <b>61%</b>  2001-2002: <b>83%</b>	2003-2004: <b>NO</b>  2002-2003: <b>YES</b>  2001-2002: <b>YES</b>	
Adult Achievement in reading, writing, English language acquisition, problem solving & numeracy	<b>A.1.6:</b> At least 60% of High Advanced ASE Students will achieve at least one personal educational goal within a literacy area (reading or math) after completing at least 12 hours of ABE instruction after data of enrollment until end of the Program's Fiscal Year.	Appropriate to student category and goal area	2003-2004: <b>00%</b>  2002-2003: <b>91%</b>	2003-2004: <b>NO</b>  2002-2003: <b>YES</b>	

			2001-2002: <b>87%</b>	2001-2002: <b>YES</b>	
Adult Achievement in education and/or employment	<b>A.2:</b> At least 25% of Adults who have identified at least one educational goal or at least one employment goal will attain one or more of their goals after completing at least 12 hours of instruction from date of entry until end of the Program's Fiscal Year and within a prescribed period of time to be determined jointly by the adult and the program staff.	Pre- and post-checklist completed by adults and program staff	2003-2004: <b>No Students</b>  2002-2003: <b>68%</b>  2001-2002: <b>70%</b>	2003-2004: <b>No Students</b>  2002-2003: <b>YES</b>  2001-2002: <b>YES</b>	
Adult Achievement in reading, writing, English language acquisition, problem solving & numeracy	<b>A.3:</b> At least 25% of Teen Parent participants who are enrolled in high school will earn a high school diploma or state recognized equivalent documenting satisfactory completion of secondary credential after completing at least 12 hours of instruction from date of enrollment until end of the Program's Fiscal Year and within a prescribed period of time to be determined jointly by the adult and the program staff.	Standardized, Norm-referenced tests for Reading and Mathematics (ITBS-Grade 11), portfolio assessment, classroom grades	2003-2004: <b>00%</b>  2002-2003: <b>71%</b>  2001-2002: <b>54%</b>	2003-2004: <b>NO</b>  2002-2003: <b>YES</b>  2001-2002: <b>YES</b>	

Indicator	Target or Standard	Measure	Result	Assessment of Progress	Explanation of Progress
<b>Child Education</b>	<b>C.1:</b> At least 90% of the children ages birth to three years old enrolled for at least three months in an Even Start program will show language and cognitive gains after at least three months from date of enrollment until exit or end of the Program's Fiscal Year.	Appropriate developmental screenings.	2003-2004: <b>16.7%</b>  2002-2003: <b>76%</b>  2001-2002: <b>92%</b>	2003-2004: <b>NO</b>  2002-2003: <b>NO</b>  2001-2002: <b>YES</b>	2002-2003 Not all enrolled children were administered post tests within the Program Year.
Child Education	<b>C.2:</b> At least 90% of the children ages birth to three years old enrolled for at least three months in an Even Start program will participate in at least 70% of the child educational/developmental program activities offered in community, center, or home-based settings from date of enrollment until exit or end of the Program's Fiscal Year.	Program attendance records.	2003-2004: <b>16.7%</b>  2002-2003: <b>79%</b>  2001-2002: <b>87%</b>	2003-2004: <b>NO</b>  2002-2003: <b>NO</b>  2001-2002: <b>NO</b>	2002-2003: Not all enrolled children were administered post tests within the Program Year.
Child Education	<b>C.3:</b> At least 80% of the children ages three to five years old whose families have been enrolled in an Even Start program for at least 7 months will demonstrate continuous progress in language development and literacy after at least 7 months from date of enrollment until exit or	Checklist documenting baseline and continual progress:	2003-2004: <b>No Students</b>  2002-2003:	2003-2004: <b>No Students</b>  2002-2003:	2002-2003:

	end of the Program's Fiscal Year.	Pre test to establish baseline within three months of enrollment  Post test to determine continual progress after at least 7 months of enrollment at exit or end of program's fiscal year	<b>73%</b>  2001-2002: <b>85%</b>	<b>NO</b>  2001-2002: <b>YES</b>	Not all enrolled children were administered post tests within the Program Year.
Child Education	<b>C.4:</b> At least 80% of the children in public school Kindergarten through Third Grade (K-3) ages five through eight years old whose families have been enrolled in an Even Start program for at least 7 months will attend school at the same or better rate as the building attendance rate after at least 7 months from date of enrollment until exit or end of the Program's Fiscal Year.	Public school attendance records	2003-2004: <b>No Students</b>  2002-2003: <b>90%</b>  2001-2002: <b>83%</b>	2003-2004: <b>No Students</b>  2002-2003: <b>YES</b>  2001-2002: <b>YES</b>	
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Target or Standard</b>	<b>Measure</b>	<b>Result</b>	<b>Assessment of Progress</b>	<b>Explanation of Progress</b>
Child Education	<b>C.5:</b> At least 60% of the children in public school Kindergarten through Third Grade (K-3) ages five through eight years old whose families have been enrolled in an Even Start program for at least 7 months will demonstrate adequate progress in reading readiness and reading skills after at least 7 months from date of enrollment until exit or end of the Program's Fiscal Year.	Checklist documenting baseline and continual progress:  Pre test to establish baseline within three months of enrollment  Post test to determine continual progress after at least 7 months of enrollment at exit or end of program's fiscal year	2003-2004: <b>No Students</b>  2002-2003: <b>92%</b>  2001-2002: <b>75%</b>	2003-2004: <b>No Students</b>  2002-2003: <b>YES</b>  2001-2002: <b>YES</b>	
Child Education	<b>C.6:</b> At least 75% of the children in public school Kindergarten through Third Grade (K-3) ages five through eight years old whose families have been enrolled in an Even Start program for at least 3 months will be promoted to the next grade level from enrollment until end of school year (coincides with the Program's Fiscal Year).	School records	2003-2004: <b>00%</b>  2002-2003: <b>86%</b>  2001-2002: <b>90%</b>	2003-2004: <b>NO</b>  2002-2003: <b>YES</b>  2001-2002: <b>YES</b>	

Indicator	Target or Standard	Measure	Result	Assessment of Progress	Explanation of Progress
<b>Family (Parenting and PACT)</b>	<b>F.1:</b> At least 80% of families that have been enrolled in an Even Start program for at least 3 months and who have experienced a transition during the Program Year will participate in at least one transition activity during the Program’s Fiscal Year.	Sign-in sheets, self-reporting forms, or family portfolio documentation.	2003-2004: <b>41.7%</b>  2002-2003: <b>90%</b>  2001-2002: <b>92%</b>	2003-2004: <b>NO</b>  2002-2003: <b>YES</b>  2001-2002: <b>YES</b>	
Family (Parenting and PACT)	<b>F.2:</b> At least 25% of families that have been enrolled in an Even Start program for at least three months and who are receiving primarily home-based services will transition to receiving primarily center-based services during the Program’s Fiscal Year.	Sign-in sheets, self-reporting forms, or family portfolio documentation.	2003-2004: <b>No Students</b>  2002-2003: <b>24%</b>  2001-2002: <b>39%</b>	2003-2004: <b>No Students</b>  2002-2003: <b>NO</b>  2001-2002: <b>YES</b>	
Family (Parenting and PACT)	<b>F.3:</b> At least 85% of parent/guardian(s) that have been enrolled in an Even Start program for at least 3 months will increase their knowledge of child development theories and positive parenting techniques from enrollment until exit or end of Program’s Fiscal Year.	Appropriate instrument	2003-2004: <b>78.2%</b>  2002-2003: <b>90%</b>  2001-2002: <b>91%</b>	2003-2004: <b>NO</b>  2002-2003: <b>YES</b>  2001-2002: <b>YES</b>	
Family (Parenting and PACT)	<b>F.4:</b> At least 85% of parent/guardian(s) that have been enrolled in an Even Start program for at least 3 months will independently increase the frequency of engaging in developmentally-appropriate and nurturing activities with their children as a result of increased knowledge of child development theories and positive parenting techniques, and participation in structured PACT Time from enrollment until exit or at end of Program’s Fiscal Year.	Staff observations, self-reporting forms, family portfolio documentation, or checklist related to specific interactive skills.	2003-2004: <b>78.7%</b>  2002-2003: <b>89%</b>  2001-2002: <b>85%</b>	2003-2004: <b>NO</b>  2002-2003: <b>YES</b>  2001-2002: <b>YES</b>	
Family (Parenting and PACT)	<b>F.5:</b> At least 85% of parent/guardian(s) that have been enrolled in an Even Start program for at least three months will increase their satisfaction with their parenting support network as a result of participating in parenting education activities from date of enrollment until exit or end of the Program’s Fiscal Year.	Appropriate Instrument	2003-2004: <b>78.2%</b>  2002-2003: <b>88%</b>  2001-2002: <b>87%</b>	2003-2004: <b>NO</b>  2002-2003: <b>YES</b>  2001-2002: <b>YES</b>	
Family (Parenting and PACT)	<b>F.6:</b> At least 85% of parents/guardian(s) enrolled in an Even Start program for at least three months and who have identified at least one goal related to family needs or community involvement will attain one or more of their goals upon exit or end of the Program’s Fiscal Year, or within a prescribed period of time to be determined jointly by the adult participant and the program staff.	Pre- and post- checklist.	2003-2004: <b>2.9%</b>  2002-2003: <b>91%</b>	2003-2004: <b>NO</b>  2002-2003: <b>YES</b>	

			2001-2002: <b>90%</b>	2001-2002: <b>YES</b>	
--	--	--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--

**C. Federal Even Start Performance Indicators**

Using the format of the table below, describe the State's progress in meeting the federal performance indicators listed for Even Start participants in your State. States should report data if local projects are using the indicated measures and the state collects the data.

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Target</b> <i>Baseline data will be set with the 2002-2003 data</i>	<b>Measure</b> <i>Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator</i>	<b>Cohort</b> Number of participants to whom the indicator applies	<b>Result</b> <i>Number of participants who met the achievement goal</i>	<b>Assessment of Progress</b> <i>Status of progress on indicator: "Target met" or "Target not met"</i>	<b>Explanation of Progress</b> <i>Description of why results were obtained or not</i>
A. Percentage if adults showing significant learning gains on measures of reading	51%	TABE:	82  CASAS:	42  CASAS:	TABE:  CASAS:	TABE:  CASAS:
B. Percentage of adults showing significant learning gains on measures of mathematics	0%	TABE:  CASAS:	0%  CASAS:	0%  CASAS:	TABE:  CASAS:	TABE:  CASAS:
C. Percentage of LEP adults showing significant learning gains on measures of English	100%	BEST	8.	8.	*Please indicate measure used.	*Please indicate measure used.

<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Target</b> <i>Baseline data will be set with the 2002-2003 data</i>	<b>Measure</b> <i>Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator</i>	<b>Cohort</b> Number of participants to whom the indicator applies	<b>Result</b> <i>Number of participants who met the achievement goal</i>	<b>Assessment of Progress</b> <i>Status of progress on indicator: "Target met" or "Target not met"</i>	<b>Explanation of Progress</b> <i>Description of why results were obtained or not</i>
language acquisition						
D. Percentage of school age adults who earn a high school diploma or GED	48%	High School Diploma	23	11.	High School Diploma	High School Diploma
E. Percentage of non- school age adults who earn a high school diploma or GED	23%	GED.	187	42.	GED	GED
F. Percentage of children entering kindergarten who are achieving significant learning gains on measures of language development		Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive:  Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) expressive:	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive:  Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) expressive:	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive:  Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) expressive::	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive:  Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) expressive:	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) receptive:  Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) expressive:
G. Percentage of children entering kindergarten who are achieving significant		Individual Growth Development Indicator (IGDI):	Individual Growth Development Indicator (IGDI):	Individual Growth Development Indicator (IGDI):	Individual Growth Development Indicator (IGDI):	Individual Growth Development Indicator (IGDI):



<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Target</b> <i>Baseline data will be set with the 2002-2003 data</i>	<b>Measure</b> <i>Measurement tool used to assess progress for indicator</i>	<b>Cohort</b> Number of participants to whom the indicator applies	<b>Result</b> <i>Number of participants who met the achievement goal</i>	<b>Assessment of Progress</b> <i>Status of progress on indicator: "Target met" or "Target not met"</i>	<b>Explanation of Progress</b> <i>Description of why results were obtained or not</i>
learning gains on measures of reading readiness		Head Start FACES Letter Naming Task:	Head Start FACES Letter Naming Task:	Head Start FACES Letter Naming Task:	Head Start FACES Letter Naming Task:	Head Start FACES Letter Naming Task:
H. Percentage of school-aged children who are reading on grade level		Please indicate source.	Please indicate source.	Please indicate source.	Please indicate source.	Please indicate source.
I. Percentage of parents who show improvement on measures of parental support for children's learning in the home, school environment, and through interactive learning activities		Parent Education Profile (PEP)	Parent Education Profile (PEP)	Parent Education Profile (PEP)	Parent Education Profile (PEP)	Parent Education Profile (PEP)

**III. Education of Migratory Children  
(Title I, Part C)**

PLEASE COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING TABLES FOR THE TITLE I, PART C, MIGRANT EDUCATION PROGRAM.

**General Data Reporting Information**

1. The tables in this section contain annual performance report requirements for the Title I, Part C, Migrant Education Program (MEP) for reporting year 2003-2004.
2. Instructions for each table are provided just before the table.

**INSTRUCTIONS: TABLE I. POPULATION DATA**

Table I requires you to report the statewide *unduplicated* number of *eligible* migrant children by age/grade according to several descriptive categories. Include only *eligible* migrant children in the cells in this table. Within each row, count a child only once statewide (*unduplicated* count). Include children who changed ages (e.g., from 2 years to 3 years of age) or grades during the 2003-2004 reporting period in only the higher age/grade cell. For example, a child who turns three during the reporting year would only be counted in the Ages 3 – 5 cell. In all cases, the Total is the sum of the cells in a row.

<b>TABLE I. POPULATION DATA</b>	Ages 0-2	Ages 3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un-grad-ed	Out-of-school	Total
<b>A. ELIGIBLE MIGRANT CHILDREN</b>																		
1. All Migrant Children Eligible for the MEP	141	192	105	113	128	135	130	121	122	141	108	125	105	81	61	1	21	1830
<b>B. PRIORITY FOR SERVICES</b>																		
1. All Migrant Children Eligible for MEP classified as having "Priority for Services"			58	48	71	76	72	65	68	61	56	69	53	49	25	0		771
<b>C. LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENT (LEP)</b>																		
1. Migrant Children that are LEP		163	77	73	69	90	87	77	36	36	24	21	9	7	5	0	3	788

<b>TABLE I. POPULATION DATA</b>		Ages 0-2	Ages 3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un- grad- ed	Out-of- school	Total
<b>D. CHILDREN ENROLLED IN SPECIAL EDUCATION</b>																			
1. Migrant Children Enrolled in Special Education	0	0	0	1	1	3	3	5	7	3	4	3	1	2	1	0	1	35	
<b>E. MOBILITY</b>																			
1. Migrant Children with a Last Qualifying Move within 12 Months (Counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period)	136	162	72	82	74	92	82	77	78	97	69	95	76	60	38	1	20	1311	
2. Migrant Children with a Last Qualifying Move within Previous 13 – 24 Months (Counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period)	5	18	17	17	23	22	28	21	26	26	22	17	19	13	15	0	0	289	
3. Migrant Children with a Last Qualifying Move within Previous 25 – 36 Months (Counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period)	0	8	8	10	16	12	12	12	11	9	11	6	5	8	2	0	0	130	
4. Migrant Children with any Qualifying Move within a Regular School Year (Count any Qualifying Move within the Previous 36 Months; counting back from the Last Day of the Reporting Period)	104	140	72	80	85	97	83	70	92	90	64	82	62	53	23	0	6	1203	

**INSTRUCTIONS: TABLE II. ACADEMIC STATUS**

Table II asks for the statewide *unduplicated* number of *eligible* migrant children by age/grade according to several descriptive categories. Include only *eligible* migrant children in the cells in this table. Within each row, count a child only once statewide (*unduplicated* count).

Include children who changed grades during the 2003-2004 reporting period in only the higher age/grade cell. In all cases, the Total is the sum of the cells in a row.

<b>TABLE II. ACADEMIC STATUS</b>		Ages 0-2	Ages 3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un-grad-ed	Out-of-school	Total		
<b>F. HIGH SCHOOL COMPLETION --</b> (Note: Data on the high school completion <u>rate</u> and school dropout <u>rate</u> has been collected through Part I of the Consolidated State Performance Report.)																					
1.	<b>Dropped out of school</b>												0	1	0	2	1	1	0		5
2.	Obtained GED																				0
<b>G. ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT --</b> (Note: The results of state assessments in mathematics and reading/language arts are collected in Part I of the Consolidated State Performance Report. However, information on the number of eligible migrant students who participated in the state assessment will be collected below.)																					
1.	Number of Migrant Students Enrolled During State Testing Window (State Assessment – Reading/Language Arts)						15	57	12	13	9	53		9	20	3	0			191	
2.	Number of Migrant Students Tested in Reading/Language Arts (State Assessment)						1	56	1	1	0	46		6	12	0	0			123	
3.	Number of Migrant Students Enrolled During State Testing Window (State Assessment – Mathematics)						15	57	12	13	9	53		9	20	3	0			191	
4.	Number of Migrant Students Tested in Mathematics (State Assessment)						1	56	1	1	0	46		6	12	0	0			123	

**INSTRUCTION: TABLE III. H. MEP PARTICIPATION – REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR**

Table III H. asks for the statewide, *unduplicated* number of children who were served by the MEP in the regular school year by age/grade according to several descriptive categories. Include children who changed ages, e.g., from 2 years to 3 years of age, or grades during the 2003-2004 reporting period in only the higher age/grade cell. Within each row, count a child only once statewide (*unduplicated* count). In all cases, the total is the sum of the cells in a row.

Participation information is required for children who received instructional or support services funded in whole or in part with MEP funds. DO NOT count migrant children served through a schoolwide program (SWP) where MEP funds were combined, in any row of this table.

*Count only those children who were actually served; do not count unserved children. Include in this table all children who received a MEP-funded service, even those children continuing to receive services in the year after their eligibility ended, and those children previously eligible in secondary school and receiving credit-accrual services.*

Served in a Regular School Year Project. Enter the number of children who participated in MEP-funded instructional or supportive service only. DO NOT include children who were served only by a “referred” service. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 1 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded instructional or supportive service. Do not count the number of times an individual child received an instructional intervention.

Continuation of Services. In row 3, report only the numbers of children served under Sections 1304 (e) (2) – (3). Do not report in row 3 the children served in Sections 1304 (e) (1), children whose eligibility expired during the regular school year.

Instructional Services. For each listed instructional service, enter the number of children who participated in MEP-funded services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 4 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded instructional service (regardless whether provided by a teacher or paraprofessional). Count each child only once statewide in row 5, once in row 6, and once in row 7 if he/she received the MEP-funded instruction (and provided by a teacher) in the subject area noted. Do not count the number of times an individual child received an instructional intervention.

Support Services. For each listed support service, enter the number of children who participated in MEP-funded services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 8 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded supportive service. Count a child only once statewide in row 9 if he/she received the specific MEP supportive service noted (*i.e.*, do not count the number of service interventions per child).

Referred Services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 10 if he/she received a referred service. This is NOT a count of the referrals themselves, but instead represents the number of children who are placed in an educational or educationally-related service funded by another non-MEP program/organization that they would not have otherwise obtained without the efforts of MEP funds. (Do not count the number of service interventions per child).

<b>TABLE III. MEP PARTICIPATION</b>																	Ages 0-2	Ages 3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Un- grad- ed	Out- of- school	Total
<b>H. PARTICIPATION—REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR</b>																																		
1. Served in MEP (with an MEP-funded Instructional or Supportive Service Only -- do not include children served in a SWP where MEP funds are combined)	5	15	33	48	69	60	63	53	52	50	42	39	35	28	26	0	2	620																
2. Priority for Service			14	11	28	26	19	23	24	16	19	12	8	8	6	0		214																
3. Continuation of Service			3	1	5	1	3	5	2	2		1					1	24																
4. Any Instructional Service	0	2	29	41	62	53	56	46	45	46	39	35	32	24	23	0	1	534																
5. Reading Instruction	0	0	23	27	32	24	22	26	22	15	11	10	5	6	5	0	0	228																
6. Mathematics Instruction	0	0	23	27	32	24	22	26	22	15	11	10	5	6	5	0	0	228																
7. High School Credit Accrual													0	0	3	1	2	6																
8. Any Support Service	0	15	33	46	65	58	59	52	52	50	40	39	29	27	25	0	2	592																
9. Counseling Service	0	0	2	2	1	1	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12																
10. Any Referred Service	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0																

**INSTRUCTIONS: TABLE III. I. MEP PARTICIPATION –SUMMER/INTERSESSION TERM**

Table III I. asks for the statewide unduplicated number of children who were served by the MEP in a summer or intersession term by age/grade according to several descriptive categories. Include children who changed ages, e.g., from 2 years to 3 years of age in only in the higher age cell. Count summer/intersession students in the appropriate grade based on the promotion date definition used in your state. Within each row, count a child only once statewide (*unduplicated* count). In all cases, the Total is the sum of the cells in a row.

Participation information is required for children who received instructional or support services funded in whole or in part with MEP funds.

Count only those children who were actually served; do not count unserved children. Include in this table all children who received a MEP funded service, even children continuing to receive services in the year after their eligibility ended, and those children previously eligible in secondary school and receiving credit-accrual services.

Served in a Summer or Intersession Project. Enter the number of children who participated in MEP-funded instructional or supportive service only. DO NOT include children who were served only by a “referred” service. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 1 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded instructional or supportive service. Do not count the number of times an individual child received an instructional intervention.

Continuation of Services. In row 3, report only the numbers of children served under Sections 1304 (e) (2) – (3). Do not report in row 3 the children served in Sections 1304 (e) (1), children whose eligibility expired during the summer term.

Instructional Services. For each listed instructional service, enter the number of children who participated in MEP-funded services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 4 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded instructional service (regardless whether provided by a teacher or paraprofessional). Count each child only once statewide in row 5, once in row 6, and once in row 7 if he/she received the MEP-funded instruction (and provided by a teacher) in the subject area noted. Do not count the number of times an individual child received an instructional intervention.

Support Services. For each listed support service, enter the number of children who participated in MEP-funded services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 8 if he/she received any type of MEP-funded supportive service. Count a child only once statewide in row 9 if he/she received the specific MEP supportive service noted (*i.e.*, do not count the number of service interventions per child).

Referred Services. Count a child only once statewide by age/grade in row 10 if he/she received a referred service. This is NOT a count of the referrals themselves, but instead represents the number of children who are placed in an educational or educationally-related service funded by another non-MEP program/organization that they would not have otherwise obtained without the efforts of MEP funds (*i.e.*, do not count the number of service interventions per child).

<b>TABLE III. MEP PARTICIPATION</b>		Ages	Ages														Un-	Out-	
		0-2	3-5	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	grad-	of-	Total
<b>I. PARTICIPATION—SUMMER TERM OR INTERSESSION</b>																			
1.	Served in MEP Summer or Intersession Project (with an Instructional or Supportive Service Only)	131	181	83	84	82	96	104	82	96	112	88	109	84	74	31	16	35	1488
2.	Priority for Service			42	36	47	53	51	43	48	42	37	55	41	45	17	0		557
3.	Continuation of Service		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4.	Any Instructional Service	29	69	44	72	73	90	92	76	84	98	57	42	35	22	2	0	8	893
5.	Reading Instruction	0	65	40	40	46	60	64	46	50	46	18	17	11	8	10	0	8	520
6.	Mathematics Instruction	0	47	33	45	52	69	71	54	56	38	19	17	11	8	1	0	8	529
7.	High School Credit Accrual													21	20	15	7	1	71
8.	Any Support Service	131	181	83	84	82	96	104	82	96	112	88	109	84	74	31	16	35	1488
9.	Counseling Service	0	1	4	12	10	13	9	9	4	14	10	16	11	8	1	0	8	130
10.	Any Referred Service	5	14	33	46	67	55	61	50	54	49	41	39	30	29	25	0	2	600



**INSTRUCTIONS: TABLE IV. SCHOOL DATA**

Table IV asks for information on the number of schools and number of *eligible* migrant children who were enrolled in those schools.

In the first column of Table IV, enter the number of schools that enroll *eligible* migrant children during the regular school year. Schools include public schools, alternative schools, and private schools (that serve school-age children, i.e., grades K-12). In the second column, enter the number of *eligible* migrant children who were enrolled in these schools. In the second column, since more than one school in a State may enroll the same migrant child, the count of eligible children enrolled will be duplicated statewide.

<b>TABLE IV. SCHOOL DATA</b>		
<b>J. STUDENT ENROLLMENT</b>	<b>NUMBER OF SCHOOLS</b>	<b>NUMBER OF MIGRANT CHILDREN ENROLLED</b>
1. Schools Enrolling Migrant Children	a. 101	b. 718
2. Schools in Which MEP Funds are Combined in SWP	a. 0	b. 0

**INSTRUCTIONS: TABLE V. K. MEP PROJECT DATA – TYPE OF MEP PROJECT**

Enter the number of projects that are funded in whole or in part with MEP funds. A MEP project is the entity that receives MEP funds (by a subgrant from the State or through an intermediate entity that receives the subgrant) and provides services directly to the migrant child. DO NOT include *schoolwide* programs in which MEP were combined in any row of this table.

<b>TABLE V. MEP PROJECT DATA</b>		
<b>K. TYPE OF MEP PROJECT</b>	<b>NUMBER OF MEP PROJECTS</b>	<b>NUMBER OF MIGRANT CHILDREN ENROLLED</b>
1. MEP Projects: Regular School Year (All MEP Services Provided During the School Day Only)	a. 1	b. 11
2. MEP Projects: Regular School Year (Some or All MEP Services Provided During an Extended Day/Week)	a. 0	b. 0
3. MEP Projects: Summer/Intersession Only	a. 5	b. 1235
4. MEP Projects: Year Round (All MEP Services Provided throughout the Regular School Year and Summer/Intersession Terms)	a. 5	b. 730

**INSTRUCTIONS: TABLE V. L. MEP PROJECT DATA – KEY MEP PERSONNEL**

For each school term, enter both the actual number and *full-time-equivalent* number of staff that are paid by the MEP. Report both the actual number and FTE number by job classification. For actual numbers, enter the total number of individuals who were employed in the appropriate job classification, regardless of the percentage of time the person was employed. For the FTE number, define how many full-time days constitute one *FTE* for each term in your state. (For example, one regular term FTE may equal 180 full-time (8 hour) work days, one summer term FTE may equal 30 full-time work days, and one *intersession* FTE may equal 45 full-time work days split between three 15-day non-contiguous blocks throughout the year.) Use only the percentage of an FTE paid by the MEP in calculating the total FTE numbers to be reported below for each job classification.

DO NOT include staff employed in *schoolwide* programs where MEP funds are combined with those of other programs.

<b>TABLE V. MEP PROJECT DATA</b>				
<b>L. KEY MEP PERSONNEL</b>	NUMBER OF MEP FUNDED STAFF IN REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR	FTE IN REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR 1 FTE = <u>180</u> Days	NUMBER OF MEP FUNDED STAFF IN SUMMER-TERM/ INTERSESSION	FTE IN SUMMER-TERM/ INTERSESSION 1 FTE = <u>30</u> Days
1. State Director *	a. 1	b. .70 FTE	c. 1	d. .70
2. Teachers	a. 3.5	b. 3.5	c. 48.5	d. 38.2
3. Counselors	a. 0	b. 0	c. .5	d. .5
4. All Paraprofessionals	a. 5.5	b. 5.5	c. 35.0	d. 32.2
5. "Qualified" Paraprofessionals	a. 5.5	b. 5.5	c. 9.0	d. 9.0
6. Recruiters	a. 3	b. 3.0	c. 10	d. 9.5
7. Records Transfer Staff**	a. 3.5	b. 3.5	c. 11	d. 9.2

\*State Director 260 days = 1FTE

\*\*Records Transfer Staff perform additional clerical, administrative and support functions

**IV. Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth  
Who Are Neglected, Delinquent or At-Risk (Title I, Part D)**

**A. Student Participation in Title I, Part D by Racial/Ethnic Groups and Gender**

In the following table, please provide the unduplicated number of children participating in Title I, Part D by racial/ethnic groups and gender during the 2003-2004 school year.

<b>Student Participation in Title I, D by Racial or Ethnic Group 2003-2004 School Year</b>	
	Number of Students
American Indian/Alaskan Native	<b>188</b>
Asian/Pacific Islander	<b>8</b>
Black, non-Hispanic	<b>4</b>
Hispanic	<b>20</b>
White, non-Hispanic	<b>478</b>

Additional racial/ethnic groups or combinations of racial/ethnic groups may be reported that are consistent with the major racial/ethnic categories that you use under NCLB.

<b>Student Participation in Title I, D by Gender 2003-2004 School Year</b>	
	Number of Students
Male	<b>528</b>
Female	<b>170</b>

**B. Program Results**

The first year for which States are asked to submit data on program results is the 2004-2005 school year. These data will be available for the first time for the 2004-2005 school year and will be requested for the next Consolidated State Performance Report that will cover the results of school year 2004-2005 activities.

**V. Comprehensive School Reform  
(Title I, Part F)**

- A. Please provide the percentage of Comprehensive School Reform (CSR) schools that have or have had a CSR grant and made AYP in reading/language arts based on data from the 2003-2004 school year.   60%
- B. Please provide the percentage of CSR schools that have or have had a CSR grant and made AYP in mathematics based on data from the 2003-2004 school year.   63%
- C. How many schools in the State have or have been awarded a CSR grant since 1998?  
  30

**VI. Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (Teacher and Principal and Recruiting Fund) (Title II, Part A)**

Performance data needed for this program will be available from another source. The Department will implement a national evaluation and data reporting system to provide essential data needed to measure program performance. States will be notified and are requested to participate in these activities once they are implemented.

**VII. Enhancing Education through Technology  
(Title II, Part D)**

**Funding Year: FY 2002**

**School Years: 2002 – 2003 AND 2003 – 2004**

<b>FY 2002 Program Information</b>
State (Approved) Technology Plan (YES/NO) _____
Year last updated: _____
Date of State Approval: _____
Web Site Location/URL: _____

**State Program Goals, Objectives and Performance Indicators**

Using the format of the table below, describe the State's progress in meeting its EETT performance indicators based on data sources that the State established for its use in assessing the effectiveness of the program in improving access to and use of educational technology by students and teachers in support of academic achievement, as submitted in the Consolidated State Application. Indicate which of the three or combination of the three Title II, Part D goals relates to your State goals.

Title II, Part D -- Enhanced Education Through Technology Goals:

1. Improve student academic achievement through the use of technology in elementary schools and secondary schools.
2. To assist every student in crossing the digital divide by ensuring that every student is technologically literate by the time the student finishes the eighth grade, regardless of the student's race, ethnicity, gender, family income, geographic location, or disability.
3. To encourage the effective integration of technology resources and systems with teacher training and curriculum development to establish research-based instructional methods that can be widely implemented as best practices by State educational agencies and local educational agencies.

Provide results for each indicator, as well as an assessment and explanation of progress. For targets with no set targets, provide a descriptive assessment of progress. Please indicate where data are not yet available.

For the purpose of completing the table below, please explain how you define the following:

1. Curriculum Integration

The Montana Office of Public Instruction technology plan for the Title II, Part D program lists the following goals and measurable objectives relevant to curriculum integration:

**Goal #1**

**Integrating Technology into Curriculum and Instruction:** All Montana teachers will be effective and efficient integrators of technology into their curriculum and instruction.

Measurable Objective 1.1: One hundred percent (100%) of district teachers will rate themselves as a “3” or better as measured by the Teachers’ Technology Use in Teaching and Learning section of the Taking A Good Look at Instructional Technology (TAGLIT) by Spring 2014.

2. Technology literacy

The Montana Office of Public Instruction technology plan for the Title II, Part D program lists the following goal and measurable objective for technology literacy:

**Goal #3**

**Increasing the Ability of Teachers to Teach Utilizing Technology:** All Montana teachers and principals will be technologically proficient.

Measurable Objective 3.1: One hundred percent (100%) of district teachers will rate themselves as a “3” or better as measured by the Teachers’ Technology Skills section (basic tools, multimedia tools, communication tools, research/problem-solving tools) of the Taking A Good Look at Instructional Technology (TAGLIT) by Spring 2014.



<b>Goals, Objectives, Targets</b>	<b>Narrative</b>
<p><b>Program Goal</b> (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate goal.)</p>	<p>Goal #3</p> <p>To encourage the effective integration of technology resources and systems with teacher training and curriculum development to establish research-based instructional methods that can be widely implemented as best practices by State educational agencies and local educational agencies.</p>
<p><b>Statutory Goal</b> <b>Indicate Statutory Goal number 1, 2, and/or 3. This Statutory Goal(s) relates to the Goal(s) submitted in your State Consolidated Application.</b></p>	<p>Goal #3</p> <p>To encourage the effective integration of technology resources and systems with teacher training and curriculum development to establish research-based instructional methods that can be widely implemented as best practices by State educational agencies and local educational agencies.</p>
<p><b>Program Objective</b> (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate objective.)</p>	<p><u>Measurable Objective 1.1:</u> One hundred percent (100%) of district teachers will rate themselves as a “3” or better as measured by the Teachers’ Technology Use in Teaching and Learning section of the Taking A Good Look at Instructional Technology (TAGLIT) by Spring 2014.</p> <p><u>Measurable Objective 3.1:</u> One hundred percent (100%) of district teachers will rate themselves as a “3” or better as measured by the Teachers’ Technology Skills section (basic tools, multimedia tools, communication tools, research/problem-solving tools) of the Taking A Good Look at Instructional Technology (TAGLIT) by Spring 2014.</p>
<p><b>Indicator</b> (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate indicator.)</p>	<p>The objective specific indicator is stated above with each objective.</p>
<p><b>Target</b> <i>Indicate status of data in 2002-03 school year (SY).</i> <b><i>BASELINE DATA</i></b></p>	<p>Objective 1.1 - Baseline Data 2002-2003 TAGLIT Data June 2003 Surveys completed: Elementary Teachers                    3187 <u>Middle/High School Teachers        3704</u> Total    6891</p>

Goals, Objectives, Targets	Narrative																										
	<p>Teachers' Tech Use: Possible Score Range = 1 to 4</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Basic Tools</td> <td>Section Average= 2.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Communication Tools</td> <td>Section Average= 1.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Multimedia Tools</td> <td>Section Average= 1.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Research/Problem Solving</td> <td>Section Average= 2</td> </tr> </table> <p>Objective 3.1 - Baseline Data 2002-2003 TAGLIT Data June 2003 Surveys completed:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Elementary Teachers</td> <td>3187</td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Middle/High School Teachers</u></td> <td><u>3704</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>6891</td> </tr> </table> <p>Teachers' Tech Skills: Possible Score Range = 1 to 4</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Basic Tools</td> <td>Section Average= 2.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Communication Tools</td> <td>Section Average= 2.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Multimedia Tools</td> <td>Section Average= 2.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Research/Problem Solving</td> <td>Section Average= 2.5</td> </tr> </table>	Basic Tools	Section Average= 2.1	Communication Tools	Section Average= 1.8	Multimedia Tools	Section Average= 1.8	Research/Problem Solving	Section Average= 2	Elementary Teachers	3187	<u>Middle/High School Teachers</u>	<u>3704</u>	Total	6891	Basic Tools	Section Average= 2.5	Communication Tools	Section Average= 2.1	Multimedia Tools	Section Average= 2.6	Research/Problem Solving	Section Average= 2.5				
Basic Tools	Section Average= 2.1																										
Communication Tools	Section Average= 1.8																										
Multimedia Tools	Section Average= 1.8																										
Research/Problem Solving	Section Average= 2																										
Elementary Teachers	3187																										
<u>Middle/High School Teachers</u>	<u>3704</u>																										
Total	6891																										
Basic Tools	Section Average= 2.5																										
Communication Tools	Section Average= 2.1																										
Multimedia Tools	Section Average= 2.6																										
Research/Problem Solving	Section Average= 2.5																										
<p><b>Target</b> <i>Indicate status of data in 2003-04 school year</i></p>	<p>Objective 1.1 - Status data 2003-2004 TAGLIT Data June 2004 Surveys completed:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Elementary Teachers</td> <td>4621</td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Middle/High School Teachers</u></td> <td><u>5313</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>9934</td> </tr> </table> <p>Teachers' Tech Use: Possible Score Range = 1 to 4</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Basic Tools</td> <td>Section Average= 2.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Communication Tools</td> <td>Section Average= 1.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Multimedia Tools</td> <td>Section Average= 1.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Research/Problem Solving</td> <td>Section Average= 2.1</td> </tr> </table> <p>Objective 3.1 - Status data 2003-2004 TAGLIT Data June 2004 Surveys completed:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Elementary Teachers</td> <td>4621</td> </tr> <tr> <td><u>Middle/High School Teachers</u></td> <td><u>5313</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Total</td> <td>9934</td> </tr> </table> <p>Teachers' Tech Skills: Possible Score Range = 1 to 4</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Basic Tools</td> <td>Section Average= 2.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Communication Tools</td> <td>Section Average= 2.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Multimedia Tools</td> <td>Section Average= 2.6</td> </tr> </table>	Elementary Teachers	4621	<u>Middle/High School Teachers</u>	<u>5313</u>	Total	9934	Basic Tools	Section Average= 2.1	Communication Tools	Section Average= 1.8	Multimedia Tools	Section Average= 1.9	Research/Problem Solving	Section Average= 2.1	Elementary Teachers	4621	<u>Middle/High School Teachers</u>	<u>5313</u>	Total	9934	Basic Tools	Section Average= 2.5	Communication Tools	Section Average= 2.2	Multimedia Tools	Section Average= 2.6
Elementary Teachers	4621																										
<u>Middle/High School Teachers</u>	<u>5313</u>																										
Total	9934																										
Basic Tools	Section Average= 2.1																										
Communication Tools	Section Average= 1.8																										
Multimedia Tools	Section Average= 1.9																										
Research/Problem Solving	Section Average= 2.1																										
Elementary Teachers	4621																										
<u>Middle/High School Teachers</u>	<u>5313</u>																										
Total	9934																										
Basic Tools	Section Average= 2.5																										
Communication Tools	Section Average= 2.2																										
Multimedia Tools	Section Average= 2.6																										

Goals, Objectives, Targets	Narrative
	Research/Problem Solving      Section Average= 2.5
<b>Target</b> <i>Set target for 2004-05 school year.</i>	Objective 1.1 - Target 2004-2005 Teachers' Tech Use: Possible Score Range = 1 to 4 Basic Tools                              Section Average= 2.5 Communication Tools                  Section Average= 2.2 Multimedia Tools                        Section Average= 2.2 Research/Problem Solving            Section Average= 2.4  Objective 3.1 - Target 2004-2005 Teachers' Tech Skills: Possible Score Range = 1 to 4 Basic Tools                              Section Average= 2.8 Communication Tools                  Section Average= 2.5 Multimedia Tools                        Section Average= 2.9 Research/Problem Solving            Section Average= 2.8
<b>Target</b> <i>Set target for 2005-06 school year</i>	Objective 1.1 - Target 2005-2006 Teachers' Tech Use: Possible Score Range = 1 to 4 Basic Tools                              Section Average= 2.6 Communication Tools                  Section Average= 2.4 Multimedia Tools                        Section Average= 2.4 Research/Problem Solving            Section Average= 2.5  Objective 3.1 - Target 2005-2006 Teachers' Tech Skills: Possible Score Range = 1 to 4 Basic Tools                              Section Average= 2.9 Communication Tools                  Section Average= 2.6 Multimedia Tools                        Section Average= 3.0 Research/Problem Solving            Section Average= 2.9
<b>Target</b> <i>Set target for 2006-07 school year.</i>	Objective 1.1 - Target 2006-2007 Teachers' Tech Use: Possible Score Range = 1 to 4 Basic Tools                              Section Average= 2.8 Communication Tools                  Section Average= 2.6 Multimedia Tools                        Section Average= 2.6 Research/Problem Solving            Section Average= 2.7  Objective 3.1 - Target 2006-2007 Teachers' Tech Skills: Possible Score Range = 1 to 4 Basic Tools                              Section Average= 3.1 Communication Tools                  Section Average= 2.8 Multimedia Tools                        Section Average= 3.1

Goals, Objectives, Targets	Narrative
	<p>Research/Problem Solving      Section Average= 3.1</p>
<p><b>Target</b> <i>Set target for 2007-08 school</i></p>	<p>Objective 1.1 - Target 2007-2008 Teachers' Tech Use: Possible Score Range = 1 to 4 Basic Tools                              Section Average= 3.0 Communication Tools                      Section Average= 2.8 Multimedia Tools                              Section Average= 2.8 Research/Problem Solving                      Section Average= 2.9</p> <p>Objective 3.1 - Target 2007-2008 Teachers' Tech Skills: Possible Score Range = 1 to 4 Basic Tools                              Section Average= 3.2 Communication Tools                      Section Average= 3.0 Multimedia Tools                              Section Average= 3.3 Research/Problem Solving                      Section Average= 3.2</p>
<p><b>Assessment of Progress</b> <i>Status of progress on indicator</i> <i>(1) Target met</i> <i>(2) Target not met</i></p>	<p>Objective 1.1 2003-2004 -#2 Targets not met</p> <p>Objective 3.1 2003-2004 -#2 Targets not met</p>
<p><b>Measurement tool(s)</b> used to assess progress of indicators.</p>	<p>TAGLIT - Taking a Good Look at Instructional Technology <a href="http://www.taglit.org">www.taglit.org</a></p>
<p><b>Explanation for not making progress -</b> <i>Description of why target(s) was not met for SY 03-04, and steps that will taken to ensure progress.</i></p>	<p>1) The data utilized reflects 31% more teachers taking the baseline assessment tool and thus represents a broader view of the actual competency levels as measured by the TAGLIT than does the original baseline data. The data also reflects an ever changing set of participants taking the TAGLIT survey as districts are on differing schedules for the assessment and the turn over of teachers in district employment.</p> <p>2) Insufficient funding to adequately fund 325 eligible LEAs to fully meet the statutory requirements. Ex. 2003 109 LEAs received &lt;\$1,000 150 LEAs received \$1,000 - \$5,000 11 LEAs received %20,000-\$100,000 The smallest allocation was \$48 and the largest was \$100,246</p> <p>3) Local flexibility and choice dilute the effect of these funds at the district level.</p>

Goals, Objectives, Targets	Narrative
	<p>The Office of Public Instruction continues to direct districts to maximize the impact of the Title II, Part D funding. Districts annually apply for the funds, and complete a Final Program Report to indicate their efforts toward the objective.</p>

**If for any reason you have modified or added Goal(s), objectives, indicators, and/or targets since submitting the State Consolidated Application, please indicate in the chart below.**

Original Goal(s), objectives, indicators, and/or targets (Indicate page number and item label as designated in the State Consolidated Application or restate goal.)	Modification or Additions
<p><b>Measurable Objective 1.1 and 3.1 as reported above</b></p>	<p><b>These objectives have been updated to reflect the goal of 100% attainment by 2014. Previously they reflected 85% attainment by 2007.</b></p>

**IX. Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act  
(Title IV, Part A)**

**A. Performance Measures**

Instructions: In the following chart, please identify:

- Each of your State indicators as submitted in the June 2002 Consolidated State Application;
- The instrument or data source used to measure the indicator;
- The frequency with which the data are collected (annually, semi-annually, biennially) and year of the most recent collection;
- The baseline data and year the baseline was established; and
- Targets for the years in which your State has established targets.

Indicator	Instrument/ Data Source	Frequency of collection	Targets	Actual Performance
1	YRBS	Frequency: _____ ____ Biennial _____  Year of most recent collection: _2003_ _____	2002-2003 _9.6_ 2003-2004 _9.6_ 2004-2005 _____ 2005-2006 _____ 2006-2007 _____ 2007-2008 _____	2002-2003 _7.2_ 2003-2004 _N/A_  Baseline: _9.6_ Year established: _2002_
2	YRBS	Frequency: _____ ____ Biennial _____  Year of most recent collection: _2003_ _____	2002-2003 _12.1_ 2003-2004 _12.1_ 2004-2005 _____ 2005-2006 _____ 2006-2007 _____ 2007-2008 _____	2002-2003 _10.3_ 2003-2004 _N/A_  Baseline: _12.1_ Year established: _2002_
3	YRBS	Frequency: _____ ____ Biennial _____  Year of most recent collection: _2003_ _____	2002-2003 _29.5_ 2003-2004 _29.5_ 2004-2005 _____ 2005-2006 _____ 2006-2007 _____ 2007-2008 _____	2002-2003 _26.9_ 2003-2004 _N/A_  Baseline: _29.5_ Year established: _2002_
4	School Discipline Report	Frequency: _____ ____ Annual _____  Year of most recent collection: _2004_ _____	2002-2003 _0_ 2003-2004 _0_ 2004-2005 _0_ 2005-2006 _____ 2006-2007 _____ 2007-2008 _____	2002-2003 _0_ 2003-2004 _0_  Baseline: _0_ Year established: _2002_
		Frequency: _____ _____  Year of most recent collection: _____ _____	2002-2003 _____ 2003-2004 _____ 2004-2005 _____ 2005-2006 _____ 2006-2007 _____ 2007-2008 _____	2002-2003 _____ 2003-2004 _____  Baseline: _____ Year established: _____

		Frequency: _____ _____  Year of most recent collection: _____ _____	2002-2003 _____ 2003-2004 _____ 2004-2005 _____ 2005-2006 _____ 2006-2007 _____ 2007-2008 _____	2002-2003 _____ 2003-2004 _____  Baseline: _____ Year established: _____ _____
		Frequency: _____ _____  Year of most recent collection: _____ _____	2002-2003 _____ 2003-2004 _____ 2004-2005 _____ 2005-2006 _____ 2006-2007 _____ 2007-2008 _____	2002-2003 _____ 2003-2004 _____  Baseline: _____ Year established: _____ _____
		Frequency: _____ _____  Year of most recent collection: _____ _____	2002-2003 _____ 2003-2004 _____ 2004-2005 _____ 2005-2006 _____ 2006-2007 _____ 2007-2008 _____	2002-2003 _____ 2003-2004 _____  Baseline: _____ Year established: _____ _____
		Frequency: _____ _____  Year of most recent collection: _____ _____	2002-2003 _____ 2003-2004 _____ 2004-2005 _____ 2005-2006 _____ 2006-2007 _____ 2007-2008 _____	2002-2003 _____ 2003-2004 _____  Baseline: _____ Year established: _____ _____



**B. Suspension and Expulsion Data**

Instructions: In the following charts, indicate the number of out-of-school suspensions and expulsions for elementary, middle, and high school students for each of the underlined incidents.

Please also provide the State’s definition of an elementary, middle, and high school, as well as the State’s definition of each of the incidents underlined below.

(If your State does not collect data in the same format as requested by this form, the State may provide data from a similar question, provided the State includes a footnote explaining the differences between the data requested and the data the State is able to supply.)

School Type	State Definition
Elementary School	
Middle School	
High School	

**1. The number of out-of-school suspensions and expulsions for physical fighting.**

State definition of physical fighting: \_\_\_\_\_

SUSPENSIONS	Number for 2003-2004 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary		
Middle		
High School		

EXPULSIONS	Number for 2003-2004 school year	Number of LEAs reporting
Elementary		
Middle		
High School		

**2. The number of out-of-school suspensions and expulsions for weapons possession**

State definition of weapons: \_\_\_\_\_

<b>SUSPENSIONS</b>	<b>Number for 2003-2004 school year</b>	<b>Number of LEAs reporting</b>
Elementary		
Middle		
High School		

<b>EXPULSIONS</b>	<b>Number for 2003-2004 school year</b>	<b>Number of LEAs reporting</b>
Elementary		
Middle		
High School		

**3. The number of alcohol-related out-of-school suspensions and expulsions.**

State definition of alcohol-related: \_\_\_\_\_]

<b>SUSPENSIONS</b>	<b>Number for 2003-2004 school year</b>	<b>Number of LEAs reporting</b>
Elementary		
Middle		
High School		

<b>EXPULSIONS</b>	<b>Number for 2003-2004 school year</b>	<b>Number of LEAs reporting</b>
Elementary		
Middle		
High School		

**4. The number of illicit drug-related out-of-school suspensions and expulsions.**

State definition of illicit-drug related: \_\_\_\_\_

<b>SUSPENSIONS</b>	<b>Number for 2003-2004 school year</b>	<b>Number of LEAs reporting</b>
Elementary		
Middle		
High School		

<b>EXPULSIONS</b>	<b>Number for 2003-2004 school year</b>	<b>Number of LEAs reporting</b>
Elementary		
Middle		
High School		

**C. Parent Involvement**

Instructions: Section 4116 of the No Child Left Behind Act requires that each State provide information pertaining to the State's efforts to inform parents of and include parents in drug and violence prevention efforts. Please describe your State's efforts to include parents in these activities.

**X. 21st Century Community Learning Centers  
(Title IV, Part B)**

Performance data needed for this program will be available from another source. The Department will implement a national evaluation and data reporting system to provide essential data needed to measure program performance. States will be notified and are requested to participate in these activities once they are implemented.

**XI. Innovative Programs  
(Title V, Part A)**

**A.** Please describe **major** results to date of State-level Title V, Part A funded activities to improve student achievement and the quality of education for students. Please use quantitative data if available (e.g., increases in the number of highly qualified teachers).

1. Montana Reads! (State Reading Initiative)  
Increase the teaching abilities of 350 teachers
2. School Improvement Planning  
Increase quality education for students in all 452 districts
3. School Improvement Effectiveness Reporting  
Increase quality education in all 452 districts
4. Summer Institutes for Teachers  
Increase the teaching abilities of 350 teachers
5. Professional Development for Teachers in Reading/Language Arts  
Increase the teaching abilities of 300 teachers
6. Assist 25 educators and districts with reading materials, information about development of reading programs, and information about standards and assessment
7. Mentoring Program for 75 teachers
8. Summer reading activities and incentives for Montana students
9. Read Well Be Well and Food for the Mind reading materials and programs for approximately 1,500 students

**B.** The table below requests data on student achievement outcomes of **Title V, Part A - funded** LEAs that use **20%** or more of Title V, Part A funds and funds transferred from other programs for **strategic priorities including: (1)** student achievement in reading and math, **(2)** teacher quality, **(3)** safe and drug free schools, **(4)** access for all students to a quality education. Complete the table below using aggregated data from all LEA evaluations of school year 2003-2004 activities funded in whole or in part from Title V, Part A - Innovative Programs funds.

Priority Activity/Area <sup>1</sup>	Number of LEAs that used <b>20%</b> or more Title V, Part A, including funds transferred into Title V, Part A (see Note) for:	Number of these LEAs that met AYP	Total Number of Students Served
Area 1: <b>Student Achievement in Reading and Math</b>	<b>232</b>	<b>197</b>	<b>94,841</b>
Area 2: <b>Teacher Quality</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>48,814</b>
Area 3: <b>Safe and Drug Free Schools</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>--</b>
Area 4: <b>Increase Access for all Students</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>5,974</b>
Note: Funds from REAP and Local Flex (Section 6152) that are used for Title V, Part A purposes and funds transferred into Title V, Part A under the transferability option under section 6132(b).			

**B.1** Indicate the number of Title V, Part A funded LEAs that did not use, in school year 2003-2004, 20% or more of Title V, Part A funds including funds transferred from other programs into Title V, Part A, for any of the priority activities/areas listed in the table under B above.   26  

**B.2** Indicate the number of LEAs shown in B.1 that met AYP in school year 2003-2004.   22  

<sup>1</sup> In completing this table, States should include activities described in Section 5131 of the ESEA as follows: Area 1 (activities 3, 9,12,16,19,20,22,26,27), Area 2 (activity 1,2), Area 3 (activity 14,25), Area 4 (activities 4,5,7,8,15,17)

**XII. Rural Education Achievement Program (REAP)  
(Title VI, Part B)**

**A. Small Rural School Achievement Program (Title VI, Part B, Subpart 1)**

Please indicate the number of eligible LEAs that notified the State of the LEA's intention to use the Alternative Uses of Funding authority under section 6211 during the 2003-2004 school year. \_\_\_\_217\_\_\_\_

**B. Rural and Low-Income School Program (Title VI, Part B, Subpart 2)**

1. LEAs that receive Rural and Low-Income School (RLIS) Program grants may use these funds for any of the purposes listed in the following table. Please indicate in the table the total number of eligible LEAs that used funds for each of the listed purposes during the 2003-2004 school year.

Purpose	Number of LEAs
Teacher recruitment and retention, including the use of signing bonuses and other financial incentives	<b>1</b>
Teacher professional development, including programs that train teachers to utilize technology to improve teaching and to train special needs teachers	<b>3</b>
Educational technology, including software and hardware as described in Title II, Part D	<b>2</b>
Parental involvement activities	<b>2</b>
Activities authorized under the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program (Title IV, Part A)	<b>2</b>
Activities authorized under Title I, Part A	<b>5</b>
Activities authorized under Title III (Language instruction for LEP and immigrant students)	<b>0</b>

2. Describe the progress the State has made in meeting the goals and objectives for the Rural Low-Income Schools Program as described in its June 2002 Consolidated State application. Provide quantitative data where available.

**XIII. Funding Transferability for State and Local Educational Agencies (Title VI, Part A, Subpart 2)**

**A. State Transferability of Funds**

Did the State transfer funds under the State Transferability authority of section 6123(a) during the 2003-2004 school year? \_\_\_\_\_

**B. Local Educational Agency Transferability of Funds**

1. Please indicate the total number of LEAs that notified the State that they were transferring funds under the LEA Transferability authority of section 6123(b) during the 2003-2004 school year. \_\_\_20\_\_\_
2. In the charts below, please indicate below the total number of LEAs that transferred funds TO and FROM each eligible program and the total amount of funds transferred TO and FROM each eligible program.



<b>Program</b>	<b>Total Number of LEAs transferring funds <u>TO</u> eligible program</b>	<b>Total amount of funds transferred <u>TO</u> eligible program</b>
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (section 2121)	<b>7</b>	<b>\$65,594.74</b>
Educational Technology State Grants (section 2412(a)(2)(A))	<b>2</b>	<b>\$15,609.00</b>
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (section 4112(b)(1))	<b>0</b>	<b>\$0</b>
State Grants for Innovative Programs (section 5112(a))	<b>5</b>	<b>\$165,670.81</b>
Title I, Part A, Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs	<b>25</b>	<b>\$177,234.28</b>

<b>Program</b>	<b>Total Number of LEAs transferring funds <u>FROM</u> eligible program</b>	<b>Total amount of funds transferred <u>FROM</u> eligible program</b>
Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (section 2121)	<b>10</b>	<b>\$281,871.55</b>
Educational Technology State Grants (section 2412(a)(2)(A))	<b>14</b>	<b>\$92,086.85</b>
Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities (section 4112(b)(1))	<b>7</b>	<b>\$33,495.08</b>
State Grants for Innovative Programs (section 5112(a))	<b>8</b>	<b>\$16,655.36</b>

*The Department plans to obtain information on the use of funds under both the State and LEA Transferability Authority through evaluation studies.*